AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. V.] (MONTHLY) [1891.

EDITED BY REV. H. J. HEUSER,

Professor of Exegesis and Introd. to S. Script., Theol. Seminary, Overbrook.

"*Ut Ecclesia ædificationem accipiat.*"
1. Cor. xiv. 5.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,

NEW YORK & CINCINNATI.

COPYRIGHT
BY
E. STEINBACK,
1891.

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. V.—JULY, 1891.—NO. 1.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

II.

THE NATURAL SCIENCES.

IN a previous article it has been our object to place before the reader a view of the action of the last Plenary Council of Baltimore regarding Clerical Studies, and to show how comprehensive and thorough it aimed at making them.

As might be expected, the subjects prescribed are principally of what may be called a professional kind. But they are supposed to rest on the solid basis of a broad general culture, and besides, they branch out of themselves into many adjacent fields of knowledge. It is in this way that we find the Natural Sciences occupying a conspicuous place in the Clerical Programme.[1] The importance thus attached to them is a matter of surprise to many. Even among the candidates for the priesthood, it is not uncom-

[1] Here, and in what follows, the expression "Natural Science" is understood in its older and broader meaning, as including, not only the study of organized bodies, their development and laws, but also that of inanimate things, now more commonly called physical science.

mon to find some who lend themselves reluctantly to such studies, considering the time devoted to them as lost for what would be more directly and more widely profitable. But a little attention should suffice to dispel such a baseless prejudice.

I.

It is true, the Natural Sciences are a comparatively recent addition to the course of studies, in secular as well as in clerical schools. From the period of the Renaissance almost to our own times, a liberal education was understood to mean simply a classical education, that is, a study of the languages, the literature and the history of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Even after the sciences had run their triumphal course for better than a century, they still continued to be studied and taught only as a specialty. France was the first to admit them into the common programme of her schools and colleges. Germany followed; and last of all came England. The ingenious pleadings of Huxley for the admission of science into the modern curriculum are still fresh in the minds of the present generation. How completely he and his brother scientists have won their cause with the English and American public needs not to be told. All know how their originally modest appeals have gradually swelled into loud clamoring for even greater share in the training of the youthful mind. In what measure are they likely to succeed, we are not here concerned to enquire. Every additional inch of ground is warmly contested by the contending parties, and the varying terms of compromise hitherto agreed upon have much more the character of an armed truce than of a permanent and peaceful settlement. One thing is clear: the sciences have come to stay. They are already in unquestioned possession of a place of honor and importance in all education of the day that claims to be liberal. Their share cannot diminish. It is almost sure to grow. As a fact, Natural Sciences absorb more of the

intellectual activity of the age than all the other forms of knowledge put together. They have more wonderful things to tell. They can point to results and awaken expectations not so much as dreamt of in other pursuits. Henceforth they cannot be set aside, any more in education than in life. This, in the present connection, is decisive. So long as the Natural Sciences are part of a liberal education, they have to hold their place among Clerical Studies.

II.

Nor should we wish it to be otherwise. Even if Science had still to fight its way and make good its claim as a great factor in education, truth and justice should compel us to side with it. Whether Science be, as claimed by Huxley, equal to literature as a means of mental discipline and culture, may be freely debated, but its great educational value cannot be questioned. Education is only the systematic expansion of the faculties, and the study of the sciences developes them all. To say nothing of Mathematics which is first to bring to the youthful mind a notion of consecutive, structural truth, and which, at all its stages, gives a sense of security and of power greater than any other form of knowledge, it is the privilege of all the Natural Sciences to strengthen and broaden the intellect. They awaken in turn and sharpen each one of the senses. They develop the power of attention. They cure the mind of vagueness and inaccuracy. They train it to observe closely, to compare things, to remark their similarities and differences, to classify, to generalize, to conclude with caution, and always, when possible, to verify. They beget a habit of going back from effect to cause, not merely in presence of what is unusual, but in everything. In short there is not a function of the intellect which they do not draw out and exercise. Once thoroughly awakened by them, the desire to know becomes insatiable. To seek for fresh knowledge, to observe, to question, to test, to look deeper into the things of Nature,

becomes a habit and a delight. The sphere of knowledge goes on widening as of itself. To the trained vision of the scientist, every hill and vale, every rock and ridge, every leaf and flower has something to tell. The very pebbles of the wayside and the herbs of the field are laden with unsuspected indications and mysterious questionings. Physics in its various branches, Chemistry, Physiology, in fact all the Natural Sciences are simply overflowing with the most stimulating and enjoyable nutriment for the mind. Each one of them brings with it a fresh, untouched treasure of truth, and becomes a new and wonderful revelation of the world to man.

And whilst its powers are being thus developed, the mind grows broader and deeper. Doubtless, even though a stranger to the Sciences, a man may see much in the facts and aspects of Nature to admire and to enjoy. But how narrow, after all, how hazy and inaccurate is his conception of the universe! How dwarfed and diminished in comparison with that of the astronomer, who sounds the depths of space, measures boundless distances, and recognizes millions of bright worlds where the naked eye can discern nothing but a faint streak of light! To the uninitiated, the earth underneath its surface is a meaningless mass; to the geologist, it is a record of countless ages, a revelation of the strange things that lived in that distant past, whilst each one of its strata, like the pages of a book, relates the story of its own formation and vicissitudes as it rose above the level of the waters or lay buried in their depths.

And so it is with the other Natural Sciences. By their great and impressive facts, by their laws spreading out into countless worlds by the bold speculations they have originated and the beautiful theories they have led to, they extend the mind in all directions, they lift it up into the highest regions of thought, and whilst giving it secure possession of new worlds of truth, they awaken in it that noble unrest which impels it to rise higher still, and see

farther, and know more. Surely this is a power which no man aspiring to liberal culture can afford to neglect.

III.

Least of all can it be set aside by the future defender of the Christian Faith. For Science is the ground on which many of its battles are being, and will continue to be, fought; and the first duty of a leader is to reconnoitre the battle-field, to ascertain the positions of advantage, and see how they may be captured and kept. In other words, the Christian apologist has to know the bearings of Science on Faith, their points of contact, few or many, real or imaginary. He must know what is strong and what is weak in the positions of the enemy and in his own. And although he may not be capable of forging new weapons or of giving the old ones a keener edge, yet he must know how to grasp and wield them. But all this requires training, and training here means the study of the Natural Sciences. He who remains a stranger to them may keep his own faith safe enough by not heeding or not realizing what is objected. But he cannot be helpful to those who are alive to such difficuties. Scientific objections have to be met on scientific grounds, and those who venture on the latter unprepared only succeed in confirming in their error the minds they should have led back to the truth.

IV.

For a priest, of course, there can be no question of taking up all the sciences, far less of mastering them. Their unceasing, enormous growth renders such a thing impossible even to those who devote their whole life to such studies. But a proper selection may be made and such as are chosen may be judiciously distributed through the various stages of the educational course. Far from being detrimental to the other studies, they will be positively helpful. As regards the objects, to choose the most important seem, by common consent,

to be the Planet which we inhabit and its great physical and chemical laws; the vast Universe of which our earth is only an insignificant portion; the human Body, as the highest form of life and the best exemplification of its laws—in a word, the elements of physics, of chemistry, of astronomy, and of Physiology. On account of its bearings on revealed truth, Geology has been regarded for many years as a specially clerical study, nor can it be entirely dispensed with, though, to be fully mastered, it requires familiarity with many other sciences.

But though early accessible such studies should not be taken up too soon. It is a mistaken, not to say a positively mischievous notion, to teach Science to children. Science is not for children. True, they are extremely eager to know, but their curiosity is entirely superficial. What they long for and rejoice in is, not laws, nor rules nor classifications, but realities, facts, strange and striking, upon which the fancy may feed. That delightful haze which envelops nature in the mind of the child is its most congenial atmosphere. Only there does its susceptible and curiously creative imagination find free play. Wonderland, not Science, is its natural dwelling-place. Science, so far as realized, only breaks the spell and dries up, may be for life, the springs of poetic feeling in the child, despoiling it, for the sake of a little precocious, and to it, almost meaningless information, of the chief beauty and attractiveness of that early age. Flowers, not Botany, insects, not Entomology—the wonders of Nature, not her laws should be revealed to the opening mind.

The age best fitted perhaps for acquiring the elements of the Natural Sciences is about fourteen or fifteen. There is in the intellectual development habitually corresponding to that age a peculiar eagerness to see into the secrets of Nature. The mind has become capable of admitting general principles and laws, whilst the memory still retains all its freshness. The higher principles, the more advanced and complicated

problems, the general theories, as well as the mutual relations of the different Sciences, require more maturity of mind. They constitute the philosophy of the Sciences, and the most suitable place for so much of them as can be mastered is alongside Philosophy proper.

V.

But at whatever time or to whatever extent they may be studied, it should be, first of all, with a constant view to clearness of conception and accuracy of statement. Confused or inaccurate knowledge is worse than useless. It is misleading, and weakens the mind instead of strengthening it. Next, the student should not be concerned to master the numberless details of the Sciences, but rather their main lines, their fundamental laws or principles, their processes and methods.

Still more should it be the object of the teacher to place all these features in strong relief, and thus to impress them deeply on the minds of his pupils. In nothing is the difference between a strong and a weak professor more visible than in the degree of distinctness, order and depth of the impressions he leaves on his hearers.

VI.

But the student must be more than a hearer. He must see His conceptions, must be helped out and fixed by drawings, specimens, experiments. He must handle, test, verify by himself, as much as possible. Nothing is equal to that direct contact with the objects and facts of Nature. What has thus been learned, is never entirely forgotten.

To the well trained mind of the Catholic Priest it is constantly brought back. Scarce has he gone forth to his work, when he finds his knowledge of Natural Science appealed to on all sides;—in the schools, of which he becomes the visitor, the examiner—sometimes the teacher;—on boards of education, of hygiene, of sanitation, where he appears as a peti-

tioner or sits as a member, in numberless questions of local interest which depend ultimately on scientific principles. A true mastery of them is in such cases invaluable. It goes farther to give credit to the man and weight to his words than any other form of Knowledge. And then it multiplies the points of contact with his fellow men. For one who cares or is able, to discuss questions of Philosophy or History, twenty will be found willing to talk of science, discoveries, inventions. Again the Priest, when well based in the elements of Natural Science, keeps pace with its progress. He appreciates and can point out to others, the importance of each step in advance; he follows with interest the controversies that arise among scientists. He enjoys the articles of journal or magazine by which the public is put in possession of the newly discovered facts and laws of Nature. Even his sermons borrow happy illustrations from the familiar fields of science, and, like the exiled duke of Shakespeare, he

> "Finds tongues in trees,
> Books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones,
> And good in everything."

As a fact, no form of religious discourse is more welcome to the modern mind than that which gathers tone and color from the facts and laws of Nature. These indeed, in their most obvious shapes, have been appealed to from the times of the Gospel down to the present day without losing aught of their freshness or power. But in the forms of modern science, they exercise a still greater attraction, especially on those who have in any degree been instructed in the facts and practices of natural science. To this fascination is due in a great measure the success of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" a book so widely read, notwithstanding its obvious defects.

All this leads to the same conclusion, that from the period of his preparation, the Catholic priest has to become familiar

with the main features of the Natural Sciences, and never cease afterward to keep up, and if possible, to increase his knowledge of them. In surveying the contents of some clerical libraries, we have noticed more than once what might be called a science section in them—manuals of science, popular presentations—sometimes the latest and best text books, showing that the owners, whilst mainly occupied with other thoughts and things, realized the help they would continue to find in a deeper knowledge of Nature. We sincerely wish that they may find an ever increasing number of imitators in the ranks of the Clergy.

J. HOGAN.

CAN PASTORS OF SOULS PREVENT MIXED MARRIAGES?

I.

OF the many weighty questions with which the pastor of souls has to deal, few are more perplexing than that of mixed marriages; yet his sacred calling as well as the laws of the Church requires him to treat it, and to do so prudently and energetically. In order, therefore, that he may be stimulated to put forth all his energies, it is necessary in the first place, that he should be alive to the importance of the subject, not only to the Church at large, but also to that portion of it confided to his pastoral care. This importance is of a two-fold character: How to prevent his people from contracting mixed marriages; and how to deal with those who have already contracted them. It is only with the former of these aspects of the subject that we have to deal in this article. I shall premise by saying that, under the name of mixed marriages are here included all marriages of Catholics with non-Catholics, whether the latter are bap-

tized or not; because both present kindred deformities, and because it is difficult at present to know with any degree of certainty, who is baptized and who is not outside the true Church.

The importance of preventing mixed marriages is apparent both from reason and from Scripture. Reason teaches us that it is impossible for any union to be happy and attain the end for which it is contracted, unless harmony exists between the parties concerned; and, if this is true of any union or partnership, much more must it be true of one so intimate as that which marriage supposes. This is so self-evident that no proof is necessary to confirm it. It receives additional force, however, from the fact that not only is the happiness of the contracting parties themselves concerned, but also that of the family, to which the union will in the order of nature give rise, and for which the parties are bound both by the law of God and of nature to provide. But in a mixed marriage, as in all marriages, the interests at stake are not merely the temporal happiness and prosperity of the contracting parties and their offspring, but much more, their eternal welfare. Yet here, precisely, is the point on which they hold creeds and opinions diametrically opposed to each other on essential points. It is impossible that there should be harmony or success in the training of a family if both parents attach due importance to the salvation of their own souls, to the great question of eternity. But if they do, it will forthwith create dissentions; while, if they do not, they lose sight of the end for which they were created, and life itself must prove a failure. In either case, the children cannot have correct ideas of religion and its importance without doing violence to the affection which nature bids them have for one at least of those to whom they owe their existence. They must believe one of their parents to be on the road to eternal ruin. Could any situation be more lamentable!

Turning to the sacred Scriptures, the mind of the Old

Testament is seen in the inspired writer attributing the deluge to mixed marriages, to the union of the sons of God, the good, with the children of men, the wicked, on account of which all flesh corrupted its way, and God repented that He had created man, and determined to destroy him from the face of the earth. (Genesis vi.) Again, when the law was delivered to Moses, and he was about to lead the chosen people into the promised land, God more clearly and emphatically expressed His extreme disapprobation of mixed marriages. Said the divine Voice from the summit of Sinai, referring to the nations of the country, which the Jews were to exterminate: "Neither shalt thou make marriage with them. Thou shalt not give thy daughter to his son, nor take his daughter for thy son; for she will turn away thy son from following Me." (Deut. vii. 3, 4.) Of the countless deplorable examples of the way in which those not of the true fold lead others astray, there is none more striking than that of King Solomon, of whom Esdras, warning the chosen people against mixed marriages, said: "Did not Solomon, king of Israel, sin in this kind of thing? And surely among many nations there was not a king like him, and he was beloved of his God.... and yet women of other nations brought even him to sin." (II. Esdras. xiii. 26.)

The whole spirit of the Christian religion is opposed to mixed marriages. If they were forbidden the Jews, because God said: "Thou art a holy people to the Lord thy God," (Deut. vii. 6.) much more must it be so of Christians, who are "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation," (I. Peter II. 9), and who constitute the mystic body of Christ. From among numerous texts that might be quoted, the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians (II. vi. 14, 15.) will suffice. He says: "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?" If this be true of all kinds

of social intercourse, it must be especially so of marriage, even if it be denied that the text refers directly to marriage, though interpreters are divided on this point. The language of the Church is no less forcible and explicit than that of the sacred Scriptures. No Sovereign Pontiff has spoken in favor of mixed marriages; but all who refer to them speak in terms of the strongest disapproval. Only a few can be referred to in this place, but they will be sufficient, inasmuch as all breathe the same spirit. Pope Clement XI. writes: "The Church in truth abhors these marriages, which exhibit much deformity in them and but little spirituality." Benedict. XIV., writing to the bishops of Holland, affirms "the antiquity of that discipline with which the Holy See has ever reprobated the marriage of Catholics with heretics." He concludes an Encyclical of June 26, 1748, with these words: "Finally, from what has been said, it is evident that in all cases in which permission or dispensation is asked from the Apostolic See for contracting marriage by a Catholic with a heretic, the same Apostolic See, as we have said above, always disapproved and condemned, and now also abominates and detests such nuptials." Gregory XVI., in a brief to the Prussian hierarchy, says: "We need not tell you, versed as you are in the sacred sciences, that the Church has a horror of these unions which present so many deformities and spiritual dangers."

The language of the Councils, the Fathers, prelates, saints and theologians of all times is merely a repetition of that of the Vicar of Christ. No one is found to speak in favor of mixed marriages, but all in terms of disapprobation. Hardly a council or synod meets, or a bishop issues a circular of a general character, without uttering a further condemnation of these unholy unions, and a warning against them. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, whose enactments are intended especially for our guidance, declare (N. 130): "Ecclesia enim semper aversata est nup-

tias inter Catholicos et acatholicos, tum ob flagitiosam in divinis communionem, tum ob gravissimum periculum vel perversionis Catholicæ partis, vel pravæ institutionis prolis nasciturae." The mind of theologians is sufficiently expressed in the subjoined extract from Scavini (vol. iii. p. 434.) "Tales nuptiae sunt prorsus illicitæ per se; et triplici jure, naturali, divino et ecclesiastico. Jure naturali propter gravem periculum perversionis et jacturæ animæ tum propriæ, tum etiam prolis futuræ. Jure autem divino; nam Apostolus tradens regulas servandas in celebrandis matrimoniis Christianorum ait: 'Cui vult nubat, tantum in Domino.' Sed ille solus dicendus est nubere in Domino, qui nubat in vera Christi Ecclesia, in qua sola Dominus nuptiali fœderi auspicabitur. Jure demum Ecclesiastico; inter innumera conciliorum decreta placet unum affere, et est Laodiceni celebrati sæculo iv. quod, canone 31 sanxit, 'fideles non debere cum hæreticis universis fœdera celebrare, nec eis filios vel filias dare.'" To all these evidences of the importance of the question of mixed marriages may be added the experience of almost every pastor of souls in the entire Christian commonwealth from the beginning of our era.

II.

The question which concerns us now is, how can the pastor of souls best prevent the evil of mixed marriages among his people? We shall first inquire what he is required or recommended to do by the laws and regulations framed by his superiors for his guidance. In the year 1868 the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide issued an Instruction to the bishops under its jurisdiction on the subject of mixed marriages, and through them, to all priests who have the care of souls; in which, among other things, are found the words: "You are earnestly exhorted to take proper occasions, studiously to teach and inculcate, both on the clergy and the laity committed to your care, what is

the true doctrine and practice of the Church respecting mixed marriages." And the Instruction concludes with these words: "Wherefore we earnestly request of your charity, that you strive and put forth your efforts, as far as in the Lord you can, to keep the faithful confided to you from these mixed marriages, so that they may cautiously avoid the perils which are found in them." The Second plenary Council of Baltimore lays down the following rule for pastors (N. 336): "Omnis opera in eo potius ponenda est, ut fideles a mixtis istis conjugiis omnino deterreantur. Hortamur igitur animarum pastores, ut semel saltem in anno, tempore præsertim Adventus vel Quadragesimæ, gravi sermone greges sibi commissos mala quæ ex iis pullulant edoceant, simulque fidei pericula indicent, quæ sponso Catholico, tum proli suscipiendæ imminent; gravissima ostendentes fuisse rationum momenta quibus permota Christi Ecclesia id genus nuptias acriter semper vetuerit, ac etiamnum vetet." And the Third plenary Council gives the following as an exhortation and guide to pastors (N. 133): "Quum totum hoc caput ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ gravissimi sit momenti, curent omnes quibus animarum cura concredita est, ut mala ex matrimoniis mixtis enascentia efficacissimis quibusque mediis præcaveantur, aut si tolli omnino non possunt, saltem maxima ex parte minuantur. Ad hunc autem finem assequendum maxime conducit: 1. frequens parochorum instructio qua fideles edoceantur de Ecclesiæ prohibitione mixtorum matrimoniorum. 2. Praxis uniformis eorumdem parochorum in casibus occurentibus impediendi totis viribus, hortationibus, suasionibus, necnon increpationibus, ne hujusmodi conjugia ineantur. 3. Examen accuratum de canonicis et gravibus causis quæ requiruntur pro dispensatione super hoc mixtæ communionis impedimento concedenda."

How can the pastor of souls most successfully apply these rules; and how act to the best advantage in the great variety of circumstances in which he is placed. He has to

do with the most unruly passion in the human breast, and with that portion of his flock, which, as a rule least of all subdue their passions. If he preaches to the people or gives special instructions, it may be that those are absent whom he hoped especially to benefit; if he gives them a good book, they will probably not read it, or peruse it under the influence of strong prejudice, prepared in advance to turn a deaf ear to its admonitions; if he wishes to admonish them in the confessional, as the place where his remarks can be best suited to their needs, and where he is at least certain of an attentive hearing, he knows that it is but seldom that many of them approach the sacred tribunal; and from the fact that they seldom confess he has slender means of knowing that friendships exist which are likely to ripen into mixed marriages. An engagement may have also been made before such persons go to confession, or they may refuse to comply with what the confessor knows it is necessary for him to require in particular cases. Finally, if he calls at their homes, they may make promises which they are not going to keep, or which in many cases they actually do not keep. They may even refuse to see him at all. Some of these it is true may be regarded as extreme cases; but that they exist is unfortunately too certain. Besides these, there are occasionally obstacles thrown in his way from the most unexpected sources; from parents who will not be convinced that a Catholic of good enough social standing can be found for their son or daughter, especially the latter.

The pastor should deal with the questions of mixed marriages with greater promptness and energy because of the difficulties that stand in his way. But how is he to do so with a well-grounded hope of success? Some of the means he will be called upon to adopt will be of a general, some of a particular character.

III.

Inasmuch as he is the divinely appointed teacher of his people, his first means of counteracting the evil of mixed marriages will naturally be the pulpit. And he will have an inexhaustible fund of argument to draw from in the Sacred Scriptures, the letters and decrees of the Sovereign Pontiffs, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the Fathers, theologians, and other sacred teachers, whose style and manner will convince him that no language, if prudent, can be too strong for the denunciation of this mammoth curse of the Church of God. He will address himself not only to those who are in danger of contracting such unholy alliances, but also to their parents. Words from the pulpit, although not so directly spoken to the individual persons whom the preacher wishes to address as private admonitions, frequently have more weight on account of the solemnity of the occasion on which they are uttered; and hence they may deter some young persons from a mistaken course, because they are spoken by the minister of God and in the hearing of the entire congregation. People often fear to do before their fellow-men what they would not hesitate to do before God. Counteracting the evil of mixed marriages by means of the pulpit is, as we have seen, enjoined by both the Second and Third Councils of Baltimore.

If there are sodalities in the congregation or it is so large that conferences can be given to the different classes separately, especially to the young men and young ladies, an excellent opportunity will be offered for portraying the evil of mixed marriages in its true colors, which may deter some who contemplate it from contracting such unions. But here, unfortunately, as in the case of sermons, not a few of those who most need the pastor's advice will be absent. But his remarks will seldom be entirely fruitless.

It is much to be regretted that young people are so little given to pious and instructive reading. And when such persons do read a Catholic book, it is not usually a book of instruction that they prefer, but rather a tale, which may act favorably enough on the imagination, but has little to do with the intellect. Of all books, the purely instructive are the most unpopular. Little has as yet been written in English on the subject of mixed marriages, but there are a few small works, besides chapters in others. [1]

A favorable opportunity of laboring for the prevention of mixed marriages is also afforded by the parochial school. Here the children are placed under the pastor's immediate care at a tender age; and his frequent explanations of the catechism and his other instructions, by teaching the respect and obedience due to the laws of the Church, and a correct idea of the sacrament of Matrimony, according to their age and capacity will indirectly prevent not a few mixed marriages, while the thorough grounding of them in the Christian doctrine, and their imbibing of the true Catholic spirit, will prepare them in advance to resist any allurements that might lead them to contract these unholy unions. At the same time they will be taught the duty of praying for supernatural light to direct them in the choice of the state for which they have been destined by their Creator. This early training will not only leave a good impression, but, what is in some sense more important, will prepare them to listen with docility to the special instructions which their age later on in life will have rendered useful or necessary; whether they hear them privately in the confessional or elsewhere, or publicly in conferences and sermons. And, although a priest cannot hope entirely to prevent mixed marriages in his congregation, he will yet have prepared the young, before the passions have gained full strength, and love for the society

[1] Ullathorne's Instruction on Mixed Marriages. Rev. A. A. Lambing's Pamphlet, Mixed Marriages; Their Origin and their Results; and a series of Plain Sermons on Mixed Marriages by the same author.

III.

Inasmuch as he is the divinely appointed teacher of his people, his first means of counteracting the evil of mixed marriages will naturally be the pulpit. And he will have an inexhaustible fund of argument to draw from in the Sacred Scriptures, the letters and decrees of the Sovereign Pontiffs, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the Fathers, theologians, and other sacred teachers, whose style and manner will convince him that no language, if prudent, can be too strong for the denunciation of this mammoth curse of the Church of God. He will address himself not only to those who are in danger of contracting such unholy alliances, but also to their parents. Words from the pulpit, although not so directly spoken to the individual persons whom the preacher wishes to address as private admonitions, frequently have more weight on account of the solemnity of the occasion on which they are uttered; and hence they may deter some young persons from a mistaken course, because they are spoken by the minister of God and in the hearing of the entire congregation. People often fear to do before their fellow-men what they would not hesitate to do before God. Counteracting the evil of mixed marriages by means of the pulpit is, as we have seen, enjoined by both the Second and Third Councils of Baltimore.

If there are sodalities in the congregation or it is so large that conferences can be given to the different classes separately, especially to the young men and young ladies, an excellent opportunity will be offered for portraying the evil of mixed marriages in its true colors, which may deter some who contemplate it from contracting such unions. But here, unfortunately, as in the case of sermons, not a few of those who most need the pastor's advice will be absent. But his remarks will seldom be entirely fruitless.

It is much to be regretted that young people are so little given to pious and instructive reading. And when such persons do read a Catholic book, it is not usually a book of instruction that they prefer, but rather a tale, which may act favorably enough on the imagination, but has little to do with the intellect. Of all books, the purely instructive are the most unpopular. Little has as yet been written in English on the subject of mixed marriages, but there are a few small works, besides chapters in others. [1]

A favorable opportunity of laboring for the prevention of mixed marriages is also afforded by the parochial school. Here the children are placed under the pastor's immediate care at a tender age; and his frequent explanations of the catechism and his other instructions, by teaching the respect and obedience due to the laws of the Church, and a correct idea of the sacrament of Matrimony, according to their age and capacity will indirectly prevent not a few mixed marriages, while the thorough grounding of them in the Christian doctrine, and their imbibing of the true Catholic spirit, will prepare them in advance to resist any allurements that might lead them to contract these unholy unions. At the same time they will be taught the duty of praying for supernatural light to direct them in the choice of the state for which they have been destined by their Creator. This early training will not only leave a good impression, but, what is in some sense more important, will prepare them to listen with docility to the special instructions which their age later on in life will have rendered useful or necessary; whether they hear them privately in the confessional or elsewhere, or publicly in conferences and sermons. And, although a priest cannot hope entirely to prevent mixed marriages in his congregation, he will yet have prepared the young, before the passions have gained full strength, and love for the society

[1] Ullathorne's Instruction on Mixed Marriages. Rev. A. A. Lambing's Pamphlet, Mixed Marriages; Their Origin and their Results; and a series of Plain Sermons on Mixed Marriages by the same author.

of the opposite sex is fully developed, which commences soon after school days, to direct properly their first step toward the selection of a partner for life. The good that may be effected in the school in this direction cannot be overestimated. If the pastor fail to labor here in the present, he can hardly expect to labor anywhere else successfully in the future.

The pastor of souls will frequently be pained at meeting with a most unexpected difficulty in some of the Catholic schools for the higher education of young ladies. It cannot be denied that some of these schools, for reasons that I am not concerned to inquire into in this place, educate their pupils out of their sphere, instead of fitting them to spend an honorable career in it; and the consequence is that not a few of these pupils come to imagine that Catholic young men are not good enough for them—an erroneous impression in which they are frequently encouraged by their misguided parents. I am not discussing the question of young ladies' academies, or asserting that young ladies should not have a good education, and one that will fit them for any station in life to which they may reasonably hope to attain. But there is a radical defect, in my opinion, in not a few of these institutions. Yet a priest dare not say a word in the way of criticism, or he will be in danger of being regarded as unfriendly, and will be told that while many of these institutions are struggling for existence, he is throwing cold water on their best efforts. But it is the good tree we should prune and improve, the bad one should be cut down and burnt. It is a fact well known, especially to missionaries, that a large number of the young ladies educated in these institutions marry out of the Church. [1]

Attendance at the public schools is another fruitful source of mixed marriages, for, as a rule neither children nor parents are remarkable for piety, and, consequently, are not prepared in advance to resist sinister influences; the laws of

[1] See Amer. Eccl. Review, vol. I. pp. 61, *et seq.*

morality are not so clearly understood nor so carefully enforced as they should be; there is nothing to foster but much to destroy a spirit of piety and docility to Church law; dangerous literature is likely to find its way into the hands of the children; and among the larger of them, acquaintances are likely to be formed which too often ripen in time into mixed marriages.

The light literature of the day, as well as a great part of the popular amusements, have also much to do with the increase of mixed marriages; the former, by instilling into the minds of youth, at the time when the passions are beginning to grow strong, lax principles of morality, and especially loose and unchristian ideas of the sanctity of marriage; the latter, by throwing girls, especially, into the company of young men, too many of whom have no correct idea of morality, and whose principal aim is the gratification of unbridled passions, whether the formality of a marriage is necessary for the attainment of their object or not. A last source that will be mentioned is the necessity which some parents of the humbler classes are under of sending their daughters to live out at too tender an age. There is no doubt that some of these girls are models of the virtues becoming their age and sex, but it is equally certain that far too large a number go to swell the ranks of mixed marriages.

The sources of mixed marriages that have been mentioned as well as others of a local character will open up for the pastor of souls a wide field for the exercise of his zeal in this all-important matter.

IV.

Of all the opportunities afforded the pastor of battling with the evil under consideration, there is none to be compared to that presented by the tribunal of confession. There he meets each person alone, who lays open to him with perfect candor, it is to be presumed, the state of his soul; and who not only confesses the sins actually com-

mitted, but also gives indications more or less clear of the manner in which temptations assail him, and in which he resists or permits himself to be overcome, besides answering such questions as the confessor may deem it prudent or necessary to ask. With the knowledge thus acquired the confessor is enabled to apply such remedies as are suited to each particular case; to enlarge on the evil of mixed marriages; to show what is the mind of the Church on the subject; and if possible, to nip the evil in the bud. Whether the penitent has the proper dispositions for receiving absolution or not, he must at least hear the confessor out, and make such promises as are required for the validity of the sacrament; or, if manifestly lacking the necessary dispositions, be refused absolution. The latter alternative generally leads even the most careless and stubborn to serious reflection, and produces a measure of fruit. It must, however, be admitted that the zeal of the confessor is sometimes checkmated by the subsequent action of the penitent in disregarding the promises made in the sacred tribunal. Again, those who keep company with non-catholics are not, as a rule, remarkable for frequenting the sacraments; and, knowing their conduct to be out of harmony with the spirit of the Church, they may frequently go to a strange confessor, especially if they know their own pastor to be strict on this point. In this way their friendship ripens into such an attachment that it is almost, if not quite, impossible to induce them to dissolve it. Perhaps the engagement is made, and even the day of the wedding fixed before the pastor of the Catholic is informed of what is transpiring. This, however, should serve to stimulate his zeal to prevent far in advance, if it be possible, the contracting of such friendships. Alas, that the life of a priest should be a constant effort, not always successful, to drive people into heaven!

V.

Two important questions here present themselves for solution: should a confessor ask his penitents whether they keep company or not; and, can he refuse them absolution for the sole reason that they keep company with non-catholics?

The teaching of theology as well as the sad experience of directors of souls proves beyond question that company-keeping, as it is generally practised, is not, as a rule, free from danger, and often not free from deliberate grievous sin, on the part of both or one of those who keep it. These dangerous or sinful liberties are not always mentioned in confession, unless they have gone to such lengths as will no longer permit the conscience to be at rest. For these reasons it appears not only not out of place, but advisable and even necessary, at least with penitents of a lax conscience, to ask them whether they keep company or not. Nor need the confessor fear that by doing so he will be in danger of teaching them anything of which they are ignorant and should not know. They all know only too well that it is customary to keep company; and many of them are not ignorant of the fact that it is often the occasion of grievous sin. Their knowledge of corrupt nature would teach them so much, supposing they had no other sources of information. But should the confessor further inquire whether the person with whom company is kept is a Catholic or not—granting that such precautions are taken as theologians require to make company-keeping allowable—a matter, by the way, of which too many young people, and their parents as well, make very little account? The confessor should ask this question, and that for several reasons. In the first place, the Catholic has generally scruples of conscience in the matter; and to the ordinary dangers of company-keeping there are added three others: that to morals from the intimate association with one who does not gen-

erally recognize as binding the strict principles of morality which the Church insists on; the danger of a promise to marry one who does not believe in the indissolubility of the marriage-tie; and the further danger of making a promise to marry one who does not understand the conditions demanded by the Church before she grants a dispensation. The importance of this question is apparent from the fact that it is here if anywhere that the pastor can hope to arrest the evil before it has gone too far; and this brings us to the second question, can a confessor refuse absolution to a penitent for the sole reason that he keeps company with a non-catholic? However anxious he may be to make use of every means of preventing his penitents from contracting mixed marriages, he must yet be told that he cannot establish a general rule of that kind, and this for two reasons: In the first place, he must deal with each individual case in the confessional on its own merits; and in the second, there are instances in which the Church, though with extreme reluctance, permits mixed marriages, and necessarily supposes that the Catholic receives absolution; and what the Church regards as allowable under exceptional circumstances, the confessor cannot condemn under all circumstances.[1]

No little good can be effected by the zealous pastor in his visits to families, and in his conversations with the marriagable portion of his flock. Finally, not only in his private devotions—for the priest is not such for himself, but for his people—but much more when he stands before the altar to offer up the Adorable Sacrifice, will he pour forth fervent prayers to God for the restraining of this great enemy of the souls of the people; and he will do so with confidence because he acts in the name of the Universal Church. The Good Shepherd who gave His life for His flock, and who placed him over a portion of it, will not refuse the spiritual nourishment necessary for their several needs. Happy will he be if by any lawful means he will be able to lessen the

[1] Irish Eccl. Record, 1887, pp. 63 et seq.

number of mixed marriages among his people; he will have performed a work that will give joy to the church, to the guardian angels of his people and to God.

A. A. LAMBING.

A DISCIPLE OF DE ROSSI.

I. *Principienfragen der christlichen Archæologie mit besonderer Berueecksichtigung der "Forschungen" von Schultze, Hasenclever und Achelis, eroertert von Joseph Wilpert*, pp. VI—103, 2 plates. Freiburg, Herder, 1889.

II. *Die Katakombengemaelde und ihre alten Copien. Eine ikonographische Studie von Joseph Wilpert*, pp. XII—81, 28 plates. Freiburg, Herder, 1891.

When we reflect on the actual state of polite learning two names suggest themselves unbidden: Theodore Mommsen and the Commendatore De Rossi. Both men are *chefs d'écoles;* both have created, or at least thoroughly remodelled, the sciences at the head of which they stand. But while a perfect system of universities and the revenues of a great state are at the former's disposal for the furtherance of his principles, methods and aims, the latter has only the innate charm of his science and the magic of his personal intercourse. Yet, strange to say, even in our material day these seem to have sufficed. The brilliant group of historical writers, archaeologists and art-critics that centres about De Rossi is something unique in the scientific world. Whoever has more than a superficial acquaintance with the life of the Eternal City will at once recall the names of Armellini, Marucchi, Stevenson and other personal disciples of the '*Maestro.*' Besides these, the French institutes in San Luigi and the Palazzo Farnese, the editors of the papal Regesta since Innocent III., the members of the various *Accademie* of

Rome, and other learned bodies, are much indebted for their progress to the direction and support of this venerable *savant*.

A first generation of his disciples spread the results of his labors by their translations. We need only mention Spencer Northcote and Brownlow,—the chief intermediaries between De Rossi and the English-speaking public.[1] Their work has been adapted to French and German tastes by Allard, Kraus and others. After them a second generation has sprung up, trained at Rome, and frequently resident there, in constant touch with the master, imbibing daily those rare qualities that distinguish De Rossi in an age of eminent scholars Italians, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Germans,—a little cosmopolitan college of brainy workers,—they are filled with the spirit of St. Maur, and there is even a touch of chivalry in their self-denial, persevering research, and attachment to *Santa Chiesa*, now, alas! unable to reward them. Not a year passes in which these younger disciples of De Rossi do not enrich our historical literature with just such contributions as we stand most in need of. Indeed, except for a few brilliant names, it might seem that they were the only ones among us who occupied themselves in a scientific way with the vital question of Christian origins, the development of doctrine, the evolution of discipline and government in the church, and similar matters of deepest import.

I.

It is not surprising that Protestant writers should follow the labors of these men with attention, and try to minimize the value of their discoveries. So it happens that within the last few years several works have appeared in Germany in which the historical and theological deductions of the school of De Rossi have been strenuously contested. Most of these works are written from a confessional standpoint. Few of the writers, if any, have taken the pains to examine personally the monuments in question. Yet the confidence

[1] *Roma Sotterranea*, 2 vols., 8vo London, 1879.

with which they maintain their theses and the scientific dress which a German writer will bestow upon his most insignificant literary effort produce an effect, especially on the general reader, for whom these works are destined. As a rule the reader is unacquainted with the principles of this new science, and mayhap already prejudiced against any fresh evidence in favor of the teachings of the Church. They *must* be wrong.

This has caused Mgr. Wilpert, an intimate friend and disciple of De Rossi, to come out with the brochure: *Principienfragen der christlichen Archaeologie* or First Notions of Christian Archaeology, in which the proper principles and method of Christian archaeological research are illustrated by practical examples, and the numerous errors of the latest "investigators" of the Catacombs exhibited in a strong light.[1] The little work, so full of facts, so clear in its exposition, so vigorous in its reasoning, has been warmly welcomed by erudite Germans, both Protestant and Catholic. An orthodox Lutheran review confesses "that Wilpert has studied in Rome, on the very ground in question, all the pertinent literary and monumental sources, gives evidence of careful training and experience, and is undoubtedly master of all the points in dispute. Step by step he follows and refutes Hasenclever's system anent the origins of the sepulchral decorations of the Catacombs. After a careful reading I feel obliged to do homage to the truth in spite of my Protestant belief. The conviction is irresistible that Wilpert has on his side the greater share of solid erudition, impartiality, and sound criticism."[2] Dr. Kraus, one of the chief connoisseurs of Christian archaeology in Germany, says that "the sharp

[1] Our author has selected as the best representatives of the anti-De Rossi tendency V. Schultze, *Archæologische Studien.* Wien, 1880, and *Die Katakomben*, Leipzig, 1882; Hasenclever, *Der altchristliche Graeberschmuck*, Brunswick, 1886; and H. Achelis, *Das Symbol des Fisches und die Fischdenkmaeler der roemischen Katakomben.*

[2] *Blaetter fuer literarische Unterhaltung.* Leipzig, 1889. No 34.

eye of Wilpert has at last settled many disputed points in the science of the Catacombs. He has positively enriched our archaeological knowledge and won a position that none may contest." [1]

The work treats; 1. of the epitaphs of the early Christians and some important types, symbols, and historical figures selected from the gallery of the Catacombs. 2. Of the professional acquirements of the author's chief opponent, Achelis, and his erroneous interpretation of certain *loca patristica* relative to the christian symbol of the fish. 3. Of the fish-symbol, and the monuments on which it is sculptured or in which reference is made to it.

The epitaphs of the Catacombs have long since been ransacked for traces of pagan influence. Among the fifteen thousand known at this date, there are some forty that bear the heathen formula D. M. (*Diis Manibus*). On this slight basis it has been conjectured that the primitive Roman Christians were not free from heathen views concerning the future state. But the paucity of these epitaphs, and the many centuries during which they may have entered the Catacombs, forbid any sensible investigator to build an hypothesis on them. De Rossi is of opinion that they stand for *Dulci* or *Dignæ Memoriae*. In any case they entered the Christian burial-places by mistake, through purchase from some heathen dealer in tomb-stones, or by inadvertence of the deacon in charge.[2]

This oft-refuted error has been taken up by Hasenclever, a Lutheran pastor in Brunswick, and extended to the entire Christian epigraphy of the earliest times. If we believe him, the primitive Christians retained, in an unreflecting way, the principal details of the heathen epitaph; were it not for

[1] *Repertorium fuer Kunstwissenschaft. Stuttgart*, 1889. No 4. Wilpert has been for years a contributor of studies on the Catacombs to the Innspruck *Zeitschrift fuer Katholische Theologie*, and the *Roemische Quartalschrift* of that devoted friend of ecclesiastical science, Mgr. Anton De Waal, rector of the Campo Santo de' Tedeschi at Rome.

[2] Kraus, *Roma Sotterranea*, Freiburg, 1878. p. 64.

such terms as EN EIPHNH, VIVAS IN DEO, and the like, we should not be able to distinguish many Christian epitaphs of the pre-Constantine epoch from those of contemporary pagans. For these categorical phrases Pastor Hasenclever offers no proof. What are the facts? Mgr. Wilpert bids us halt at the Catacomb of Priscilla and study there the 257 epitaphs, whole or fragmentary, that a happy chance has laid bare within a few years.[1] It is no longer question of picking out here and there an epitaph from the thousands that were written during the first centuries. Here is a complete family of epitaphs, a real *Corpus Inscriptionum Christianarum*, and the proper source, if any, in which to study the evolution of the Christian sepulchral inscription. A study of these ancient marbles shows us that:

1. The formula D. M. is never seen in the cemetery of Priscilla (one of the most ancient in Rome); it occurs on every second heathen epitaph.

2. The Christian epitaphs are very laconic,—frequently no more than a name in Greek capitals,—CLAUDIANUS, EUSEBIA, MARCELLINA; the heathen epitaphs are very diffuse.

3. The heathen never fails to enumerate his titles of honor: the magistracies, offices, and trusts confided to him; with, perhaps, a single exception, these are never met with in the early Christian epitaphs, certainly not in the cemetery of Priscilla.

4. The quality of slave or freedman is very generally inscribed on the heathen epitaphs of the lower classes; the Christian epitaph either observes complete silence in this regard, or a new and tender word is coined for the occasion; *alumnus* θρεπτός. Before the Christian God the dead Flavii, Caecilii, Acilii Glabriones are no more than Stichus or Bubulus.

5. The Christian sculptures on his tomb-stone an anchor, palm or olive branch with the apostolic greeting *Pax te-*

[1] Edited by De Rossi in the *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*, 1886, p. 34. sqq.

cum or some similar pious acclamation; needless to say that the like is never seen in heathen epitaphs.

6. Many Christian epitaphs contain petitions for prayers and mementos during Mass in the Catacombs; others employ such terms as *dormitio, dormit.* Every student knows that the latter are totally foreign to the heathen views of the future state.

7. The epitaphs of the Christians insist at times on the new religious conception of life, death, the end of man and the world and similar matters; when the heathen epitaph is not blasphemous or cynical, it invites the passer-by to an unstinted enjoyment of the good things of life.

"The Christian epitaph," concludes Wilpert, "differs from that of the heathen rather by what it omits than by positive details. Its peculiarities are not the result of written rules nor of oral traditions; they flow spontaneously from the teachings on which the new religious organism was based, and which are reflected in the ancient epitaphs as in a faithful mirror."[1]

[1] Wilpert *Principienfragen*, p. 3. Compare De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, I. p. 341.; II. p. 301. The reader will find other instructive and entertaining details in the work of Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, *The Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, London, 1878, c. IV–V. p. 58. sqq. It will be scarcely necessary to ask pardon for inserting here an eloquent paragraph from one of the chief masters of Christian epigraphy, M. Edmond Le Blant, of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres: "Chez les fidèles qui virent l'âge des persécutions, l'on trouve deux sortes d'épitaphes: l'une ne donnant qu'un nom, une acclamation, suivant la mode antique; l'autre conçue dans le type païen, et contenant parfois à peine un signe reconnaissable. Tel est le premier âge. Le temps marche, le monde nouveau s'organise, et le style lapidaire va se régler comme toute autre chose. Le Chrétien ne saurait imiter ce que fait le gentil; l'évangile l'a commandé. Tout d'abord on effacera de l'épitaphe le nom du père terrestre, l'indication de la condition sociale, de la profession, de la patrie. Ce pas fait, une mention du lieu d'ici-bas subsiste encore dans les noms de ceux qui ont élevé le tombeau; elle va disparaître à son tour. L'épitaphe n'a dès lors plus rien du type ancien. L'idée nouvelle n'a pas seulement détruit, mais édifié, on doit le voir par les sépultures mêmes. L'idolâtre pleure ses morts plongés dans les ténèbres; tout est funeste à ses yeux dans le dernier jour; il ne le note point sur la tombe. Mais le fidèle voit ceux quil a perdus vivants dans la lumière d'en haut; la mort est pour lui la vraie naissance; il en doit donc garder une mémoire pleine d'allégresse;

The terse and vigorous argumentation of Wilpert is unanswerable. He knows every epitaph and tomb, every crooked lane and silent death-chamber of the immense Christian necropolis. He possesses, moreover, in a high degree, that delicate unerring sense of right and just which is indispensable to an impartial critic. He has also a sympathy for the persecuted members of the primitive *ecclesia fratrum*, those incomparable men and women whose blood cemented the foundations of the Church. These qualities are too often wanting in his opponents. We are therefore justified in awarding him our confidence in his comments on the principal symbolic frescoes in the Catacombs.

The Christians of the first three centuries had a complete system of symbols both in words and in art. It had its origin, partly in the necessity they were under of protecting their doctrines and services from pagan blasphemy, partly in the natural tendency to make their teachings intelligible and so fix them in the minds of the ignorant and dull. "We decorate our churches" wrote Gregory the Great, to Serena, "that those who cannot read may understand the word of God."[1] The use of images among the first Christians is no

la dalle funéraire en rappelera le jour. C'est le dernier mot de l'épigraphie chrétienne; dès que cette date trouve place, sa forme est faite et ne peut plus acquèrir." Le Blant, *Inscriptions Chrétiennes de la Gaule*. vol. II. pp. xxxvii-viii. The eminent author agrees substantially with Mgr. Wilpert. We need not remind the reader that the latter touches this important question only *en passant*, in refutation of Hasenclever's exaggerations, and considers merely the series of epitaphs in the cemetery of Priscilla.

[1] Lib. IX. ep. 115, ed. Maur. The authority of St. Gregory is somewhat late, it is true. But he was Bishop of Rome, i. e. of a see notably tenacious of ancient traditions. His words express the general practice of a church, in which uninstructed masses were received from the beginning, and agree with the *motif* of church decoration as expressed by Prudentius and St. Paulinus of Nola. I know that there are other origins proposed for the extensive system of decoration followed by the early Catholic masters. M. Le Blant finds the first impulse (for the decoration of the Christian sarcophagi of Gaul) in the Office of the Dead, or those very ancient prayers of the *Commendatio animæ: Libera, Domine, animam servi tui, sicut liberasti Abraham....Moysen... Susannam*, etc. Liell in his important work on the Blessed Virgin, extends this to the Roman Catacombs. But we must not

longer a matter of dispute—we have found the originals or their survivals. But their symbolical character remains to be proved. Monsignor Wilpert chooses a few of the principal frescoes, and convincingly illustrates their use as expressions of the great Christian doctrines concerning Christ, Baptism, the Resurrection, the Liturgy, the Primacy of Peter, and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

He examines in succession the symbols of Orpheus, the sweet irresistible singer, type of the grace, love and power of Christ; the personification of the seasons, symbolic of the benefits of the Creator and Preserver; the Good Shepherd and the Lamb; the Dove, Fish, Dolphin, Jonas, and the Resurrection of Lazarus. In a few brief phrases we learn the meaning of each symbol, as well as what it does not mean. From there he passes on to the sin of our first parents, the sacrifice of Abraham, Daniel in the lions' den, and the Three Youths in the fiery furnace. He treats more in detail the scene of Moses striking the rock and the adoration of the Magi, and closes with the miraculous cures of the paralytic and the man born blind, the Crowning with Thorns and the wise and foolish virgins. It is impossible to follow him through all the details. Only one who is thorough master of the relative material could compress so much exact erudition into so few pages.

The latter half of the work (pp. 50–100) is occupied with a welcome and exhaustive discussion of the famous fish-

overlook the influence of the Pope and the Deacon-Administrator. They had surely something to say, at least in St. Calixtus concerning the ornamentation of the chapels and larger burial-places. If so, they drew on the public liturgy rather than on such prayers as the *Commendatio animæ*. It was sung, daily, was more familiar to churchmen, and contained allusions to the chief historical figures of the Old Testament. It seems natural that they should have had in view the instruction of the people, no less than a modern bishop in the decoration of his cathedral; the conditions, especially in times of persecution, were substantially the same. Is it necessary to assign only *one* motive for the productions of an art that lasted several centuries? Is it not probable that *several* motives concurred, vi: (a) that assigned by St. Gregory, (b) the influence of the public liturgy, (c) the *Commendatio animæ*, (d) the personal taste of the proprietor of the grave or cemetery?

symbol. It is safe to say that no future investigator can afford to ignore the arguments he brings forth in support of the thesis that the fish in the Catacombs is a symbol of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and Saviour of men. He leaves it equally clear that the fish is the symbol of the Eucharist. [1]

Mgr. Wilpert has made good use of two epitaphs in his treatment of the fish-symbol. The first belongs to a certain Abercius, and was discovered in 1882 by the English traveller W. Ramsay in the wall of a bath at Hieropolis in Phrygia. [2] The second is that of Pectorius of Autun, found in 1839 by some grave-diggers in an ancient cemetery at Autun, in France [3] As these inscriptions are not easily accessible, we reproduce them for the benefit of our readers; they are irrefragable proofs that the Christians of the middle of the second century and the first half of the third possessed a symbolic language, and practised the *disciplina arcani.*

[1] See the important Memoirs of De Rossi and Cardinal Pitra, in the *Spicilegium Solesmense.* Paris, 1855, vol. III., pp. 499–584.

[2] Abercius was bishop of Hieropolis in the latter half of the second century. His epitaph was well known to the learned through his life in the collection of Metaphrastes, but as Tillemont had pronounced the biography apocryphal, little attention was paid to its contents. *Revue des Questions historiques,* (Duchesne) July, 1883, p. 7. Bolland. *Acta SS.* oct. 22, p. 493. De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ,* 1888. Vol. II., pars. I. p. XII seqq. Both De Rossi and Wilpert think that the epitaph was composed between A. D. 163 and 180. See also *Annales de Philosophie Chretienne,* 1883, pp. 437–446; *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia,* by W. Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 1883, p. 474 sqq., and the excellent commentary of Lightfoot in *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part II., vol. I. London, 1885, pp. 476–485.

[3] The epitaph of Pectorius has been frequently discussed and its date variously estimated. We may safely follow the opinion of De Rossi, who attributes it to the first half of the third century. The chief objection is based on the form of the letters that apparently belong to the period of declining art, (Marriott, *Testimony of the Catacombs,* London, 1878) but De Rossi brings a parallel from the end of the second century. See Pohl. *Das Ichthys—Monument von Autun.*

EPITAPH OF ABERCIUS.

Ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολείτης τοῦτ' ἐποίησα
Ζῶν ἵν' ἔχω καιρῷ(?) σώματος ἔνθα θέσιν.
Οὔνομ' Ἀβέρκιος ὤν, ὁ μαθητὴς ποιμένος, ἁγνοῦ,
Ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσιν πεδίοις τε
Ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει μεγάλους πάντη καθορῶντας·
Οὗτος γὰρ μ' ἐδίδαξε (τὰ ζωῆς?) γράμματα πιστά·
Εἰς Ῥώμην ὃς ἔπεμψεν ἐμὲν βασίληαν ἀθρῆσαι
Καὶ βασίλισσαν ἰδεῖν χρυσόστολον χρυσοπέδιλον.
Λαὸν δ' εἶδον ἐκεῖ λαμπρὰν σφραγεῖδαν ἔχοντα.
Καὶ Συρίης πέδον εἶδα καὶ ἄστεα πάντα, Νίσιβιν,
Εὐφράτην διαβάς· πάντη δ' ἔσχον συνο(μίλους)·
Παῦλον ἔχων ἔπο ...., πίστις πάντη δὲ προῆγε,
Καὶ παρέθηκε τροφὴν πάντη ἰχθὺν ἀπὸ πηγῆς
Πανμεγέθη, καθαρόν, ὃν ἐδράξατο παρθένος ἁγνή,
Καὶ τοῦτον ἐπέδωκε φίλοις ἔσθειν διὰ παντός,
Οἶνον χρηστὸν ἔχουσα, κέρασμα διδοῦσα μετ' ἄρτου.
Ταῦτα παρεστὼς εἶπον Ἀβέρκιος ὧδε γραφῆναι·
Ἑβδομήκοστον ἔτος καὶ δεύτερον ἦγον ἀληθῶς.
Ταῦθ' ὁ νοῶν εὔξαιτο ὑπὲρ Ἀβερκίου πᾶς ὁ συνῳδός·
Οὐ μέντοι τύμβῳ τις ἐμῷ ἕτερον τινα θήσει·
Εἰ δ' οὖν, Ῥωμαίων ταμείῳ θήσει δισχίλια χρυσᾶ,
Καί χρηστῇ πατρίδι Ἱεροπόλει χίλια χρυσᾶ.[1]

[1] We give the epitaph according to the restoration of De Rossi (the original is considerably mutilated), with his Latin translation.

"Electæ civitatis civis hoc feci vivens ut habeam (quum tempus erit?) corporis hic sedem. Nomen (mihi) Abercius, discipulus (sum) pastoris immaculati, qui pascit ovium greges in montibus et agris, cui oculi sunt grandes cuncta conspicientes: Is me docuit litteras fideles (vitæ, i. e. doctrinam salutarem) qui Romam me misit urbem regiam contemplaturum visurumque reginam aurea stola, aureis calceis decoram: ibique vidi populum splendido sigillo insignem; et Syriæ vidi campos urbesque cunctas, Nisibin quoque, transgresso Euphrate: ubique vera nactus sum (familiariter) colloquentes (i. e. fratres concordes), Paulum habens . . . Fides vero ubique mihi dux fuit præbuitque ubique cibum *ΙΧΘΥΝ* (piscem) e fonte ingentem, purum, quem prehendit virgo illibata deditque amicis perpetuo edendum, vinum optimum habens, ministrans mixtum (vinum aqua mixtum) cum pane. Hæc adstans Abercius dictavi heic inscribenda, annum agens vero septuagesimum secundum. Hæc qui intelligit quique eadem sentit oret pro Abercio.

Neque quisquam sepulcro meo alterum superimponat: sin' autem, inferat ærario Romanorum aureos bis mille et optimæ patriæ Hieropoli aureos mille."

EPITAPH OF PECTORIUS.

Ἰχθύος ο(ὐρανίου θε)ῖον γένος ἤτορι σεμνῷ
Χρῆσε · λαβὼ(ν πηγὴ)ν ἄμβροτον ἐν βροτέοις
Θεσπεσίων ὑδάτων · τὴν σὴν φίλε θάλπεο ψυ(χήν)
Ὕδασιν ἀενάοις πλουτοδότου σοφίης·
Σωτῆρος ἁγίων, μελιηδέα λάμβανε β(ρῶσιν)
Ἔσθιε πινάων, ἰχθὺν ἔχων παλάμαις.

Ἰχθύϊ χό(ρταζ') ἆρα, λιλαίω, δέσποτα σῶτερ.
Εὖ εὕδοι μ(ή)τηρ, σε λιτάζομε, φῶς τὸ θανόντων.
Ἀσχάνδιε (πάτ)ερ, τῶμῷ κε(χα)ρισμένε θυμῷ,
Σὺν μ(ητρί)γλυκερῇ καί ἀδελφειοῖσιν ἐμοῖσιν,
Ἰ(χθύος εἰρήνῃ σέο) μνήσεο Πεκτορίουο.[1]

The epitaph of Abercius offers a vivid picture of the unity of faith and liturgy in the second century of the Christian era. The archaeologist finds in it an evidence of Christian symbolism, a solid starting-point for the study of the art of the Catacombs. The historian sees in it the super-eminent position of the Roman Church in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, (161–180). Abercius calls her "the golden-robed, golden sandalled queen."[2] He probably met St. Polycarp and St. Justin at Rome, and might have assisted at a council against the Marcionites. According to a tradition which this epitaph renders respectable, such a

[1] "Piscis cælestis divinum genus corde puro utere, hausto inter mortales immortali fonte aquarum divinitus manantium. Tuam, amice, foveto animam aquis perennibus sapientiæ largientis divitias.—Salvatoris sanctorum suavem sume cibum; manduca esuriens *ΙΧΘΥΝ* tenens manibus."

Wilpert offers the following translation of the second strophe of the epitaph:

Ichty igitur satia, te supplex rogo, Domine Salvator: bene requiescat mater, te precor, lumen mortuorum. Aschandi pater, meis carissime visceribus, tu, cum mater dulcissima et fratribus meis, in pace Domini dormias tuumque in mente habeas Pectorium.

[2] The epitaph recalls the strong words of St. Ignatius to the Romans: "ἐκκλησίᾳ ἠγαπαμένῃ καὶ πεφωτιμένῃ ..... ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων ———, ... προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, κτλ. Funk. *Patres App.* I. p. 212. Cf. the contemporary epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans. Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. iv. 31. (Ed. Laemmer p. 305). The strong

council was held under the presidency of Pope Anicetus.[1] When we see Catholic bishops assembling at Rome, in the latter half of the second century, under the presidency of the Pope, to discuss the highest interests of the Church; when we find at Rome, at the same time, the chief Christian writers, and read the praises of the Roman Church and Pope in such independent sources as Dionysius of Corinth and Abercius of Hieropolis, we can no longer be surprised at the decisive words of Saint Irenaeus,—he merely echoed the prevalent opinion of his day. Our sources for this early epoch are few and mutilated, but they show the Roman Bishop the first to strike at nascent heresy, the first to decide questions of general ecclesiastical discipline, the chief benefactor of the brethren throughout the empire, the head of a church celebrated by contemporary martyrs and bishops for the splendor of its faith and the mildness of its rule.[2]

Very interesting are the pages on the Good Shepherd (14–16). They effectually demolish the claim that the most tender of our ancient symbols suggested by the Divine Master Himself (John, x, 14) had a heathen origin. Moses striking the rock (pp. 23–33) from which the living waters issue, is undeniably the type of Saint Peter. The similarity of the features of the Jewish leader, and those of St. Peter, the wand of authority carried by both, and the name PETRUS over a figure of Moses striking the rock, leave no doubt that the Roman Church saw in Saint Peter the chief, guide, teacher and judge of the New Israel.[3]

points of this epitaph are acknowledged by Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte.* (Ed. 2ª) I. pp. 288, 404, 406.

[1] Mansi, Coll. Conc. I. 682; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte I. 102.

[2] In this connection Professor Adolph Harnack of Berlin, makes some remarkable concessions. *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. I. (Ed. 2ª), pp. 400–412.

[3] The similarity of features is most striking in the gilded glasses found in the Catacombs. It is on one of these objects of Christian art that the name of St. Peter is seen over the figure of Moses. These glasses date from A. D. 250–350, and not as has been maintained, from the middle of the fifth century. See Liell, *Darstellungen der allerseligsten Jungfrau in den Katakomben.* Freiburg, 1887, pp. 185–197.

The eucharistic frescos in the 'Sacrament-Chapels' of Saint Calixtus,—that series of *cubicula* close to the well-known Papal Vault,—are treated at length (pp. 32–58). The important thesis of the existence of a Christian cemetery in *Vaticano* (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II. 28, 6.), since the days of St. Peter is well sustained by monumental evidence (pp. 62, 67, 73, 76), notably by a careful study of the famous sarcophagus of LIVIA PRIMITIVA, now in the Louvre.[1] It is interesting to note (pp. 60, 96) the origin of the priestly vestments in the pallium of the consecrating priest.[2]

Such studies deserve recognition, at least from the students of Catholic theology, history, liturgy, etc., the origins of which they so happily illustrate. The classical antiquary needs many gifts and long years of study, to throw light on the obscure pages of the past. But he is much more favorably situated than the searcher in the Catacombs. The materials of the former lie above ground, in the light of day, in great libraries, correct and complete editions; the student of the Catacombs must work under ground, by dim candle-light. He must spend long hours in difficult positions, sketching figures or groups whose outlines are scarcely visible after the lapse of so many centuries. His life is not always safe, and he can only work at certain times, and a certain number of hours. In the dark and narrow corridors he stumbles upon a broken slab, with scarcely a word entire,—only a few remnants of letters visible. Or again, he finds an allegorical group whose chief figures have fallen a prey to the tooth of time or the pick of the modern *fossor*. From these unpromising data he must work out the solution of the problem. What he cannot take home, he sketches; he searches his Benedictines through and through, goes over for the thousandth time the spare remnants of ante Nicene Christian lit-

[1] See on this much disputed question, the new edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, with text, introduction, and commentary, by the Abbé Louis Duchesne. Paris, 1886, vol. I., pp. clv. 121, 125, 176, 193.

[2] In the cemetery of St. Calixtus, cubiculum A^3 on De Rossi's map. in his *Roma Sotterranea*.

erature, and seeks out reminiscences and impressions of the past in the *itineraria*, pilgrim guides, and chronicles of the early Middle Ages. He must compare, combine, analyze, and apply every trick of analogy and hypothesis,—often he is driven back upon his imagination. But he does not lose courage. His is a scientific work. According to the material before him,—its age, condition, place of discovery,—he applies all the practical aids that modern criticism has created. Gradually he dispels the darkness that enveloped his object, until suddenly, as the poet finds his rhyme or the philosopher solves his difficulty, the light falls upon him, the threads of the knot are loosed, the *membra disjecta* of his argumentation take on shape and life, confirm, illumine, and support one another. It is a miniature battle-field where all the finer faculties are called into play. The works of De Rossi are full of such exhibitions of the power of mind over matter, and his disciples have acquired no small skill in the new and difficult craft of historical criticism. Their highest reward, not to speak of the consciousness of good service rendered the truth, is the master's praise: *Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est.*[1]

[1] Prof. Orazio Marucchi reports in the *Osservatore Romano* of March 1st, a new and important discovery by Wilpert, in the Catacombs of SS. Peter and Marcellinus. It is a series of nine frescoes, five in rectangular and four in circular spaces,—all forming one great composition. The style shows them to belong to the middle of the third century. They represent 1. the Annunciation, 2. and 3. the Adoration of the Magi, 4. the Healing of the man born blind, 5. (in the centre of the vault) the Saviour seated on a throne among Saints, 6—9, in the circular spaces between, are the four Orantes, symbolical of the deceased occupants of the crypt. This complete cycle is the most important discovery in the Catacombs since the finding of the frescoes in the cemetery of Priscilla. It bears out triumphantly two theses of De Rossi: 1. that neither common domestic affection nor mere love of decoration were the guiding motives of the Christians in the ornamentation of the Catacombs, but *exalted doctrinal ideas;* 2. that the principal frescoes of the Catacombs were not left to individual whim, but executed under just as careful ecclesiastical supervision as the great portals of Freiburg or Strassburg Cathedral. The logical connection of the ideas of Incarnation, physical and moral manifestation of Christ, particular judgment by Him, and reward of the good show that some theologian directed the composition. Naturally the Catacomb-frescoes acquire a new value from this stand-

Some fault has been found with the sharp polemical tone of the work. The author is easily the superior of Achelis, Schultze, and Hasenclever, whose errors and misquotations he corrects at almost every page. For that reason he can afford to deal more gently with his opponents.[1] He will find an admirable example in the great *maestro* De Rossi whose cogent pages lose nothing by their calm and dignified style.

We hope this little work is only the prelude to larger volumes in which Mgr. Wilpert will illustrate the early Christian life, manners, and belief, from the rich monumental treasures of the Catacombs. Doubtless the works of Northcote—Brownlow, Kraus, de Richemont, Allard and others furnish much useful information. But they are only (*sit venia verbo*) popularizations of one man's life-labor. They only skim the surface of the huge sea of materials. In Wilpert we hail an independent, scientific searcher of our Christian origins, as the Catacombs exhibit them, formed in the best of schools—under the eye of De Rossi,—and filled with enthusiasm tempered by experience and self-control.

II.

The second work of Mgr. Wilpert brings us back to the very beginnings of the science of Christian archaeology. It is well known that we owe many of the current illustrations of the catacombs to the industry of Antonio Bosio, an antiquary of great merit (†1629). He had been preceded by the

point. They help to fill up the many and great breaks in the official literature and public records of the first three centuries. In the fresco of the Adoration of the Magi the Monogram of Christ is intertwined with the star. This is a detail of considerable importance of which we shall doubtless hear more in the monograph that Mgr. Wilpert promises us for the near future.

[1] Prof. Victor Schultze of the University of Greifswald gave the immediate provocation to Wilpert's work in an article of the *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben*, 1888, p. 296, wherein he maintained that "German Protestant archæological science was superior to that of the Roman Catholics, possessed a surer method, maturer judgment, etc." Whoever cares to see classic examples of this method and judgment will find them on pp. 9, 19, 34, 38, 42, 50, of Wilpert's work.

Dominican Ciacconio, whose unedited copies of Catacomb frescoes, made between 1578–1583, are yet preserved in the Vatican Library,[1] and by two Belgian *savants*, Philip De Winghe and Jean l'Heureux. De Winghe was a young man of brilliant parts and great enthusiasm for the infant science. But he died early, at Florence, in 1592, and his valuable sketches and MSS. have not been seen since 1622. L'Heureux, better known as Macarius, was a contemporary and intimate friend of Bosio. After twenty years of labor his book was ready for the press in 1615, when he too died, and Bosio remained alone to prosecute the work.[2]

When, in 1629, Bosio prepared to issue the results of his researches in the Catacombs, he had spent thirty-five years of labor on them. But the unhappy fate of his predecessors overtook him: he died while the plates were being prepared. The nascent science seemed nipped in the bud. He had friends, however, who did not abandon his cherished design.[3] The MSS. and plates were confided to the Oratorian, Severano, under whose direction, and in commission of the Knights of Malta, the elegant and imposing folio *Roma Sotterranea* made its appearance in 1632—more than fifty years after the discovery of the Catacombs in 1578.[4]

[1] Codex vat. lat. chart. 5409. fol 1-38.

[2] The MSS. of Macarius lay unedited until 1856, when they were published by the Jesuits Garrucci, Cahier and Martin, *Hagioglypta sive picturæ et sculpturæ sacræ antiquiores, præsertim quæ Romæ reperiuntur, explicatæ a Joanne l'Heureux (Macario)*. Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1856. Both De Winghe and l'Heureux were students of Louvain. Reusens (*Les Eléments d'Archeologie chretienne*. Paris, 1890, I. p. 57). has some interesting details concerning them.

[3] Bosio was born in Malta, and lived at Rome with his uncle, procurator of the Knights. The antiquary must have been on friendly terms with the latter, for he left them all he had, even his MSS. Their ambassador at Rome, Prince Aldobrandini, showed Bosio's work to Cardinal Barberini, brother of the reigning Pope Urban VIII. The Cardinal, himself a Maecenas, recognized its value and chose Severano as editor. The knights defrayed the expenses, and the work was dedicated to Urban VIII. Its appearance was welcomed in Germany and France. In England it went unnoticed; even Bingham's great work failed to draw anything from the newly opened sources. K[illegible], *Roma Sott.* 1878, p. 5.

[4] The editor was well praised for [illegible] work by a Roman Academician in the following epigram:

Bosio was undoubtedly the 'Columbus of the Catacombs.' He followed, as a rule, correct methods in his researches. But the means of research were few and imperfect; he could not help making many errors which the wider experience and critical aids of De Rossi and his school have been able to correct. It is undeniable that the unedited copies of Ciacconio and the printed illustrations of Bosio are often faulty and inexact. Yet both these sources are daily appealed to in support of various theses. Hence it becomes of great importance that the correct text of the monuments copied by Ciacconio and Bosio should be restored, as far as it is now possible. For this purpose, all their sketches, copies, draughts, etc., must be submitted to a scientific examination, and compared with the originals, when these exist. Many of the latter, however are totally destroyed; others are badly defaced; still others are inaccessible or have shared the fate of the crypts and *cubicula* that once held them. There remains then only one means of control, viz. to compare the copies of Ciacconio and Bosio with the few remaining originals, with one another, and with the yet existing originals of similar subjects.

It is this important work,—the critical revision of all known collections of copies of Catacomb-frescoes previous to this century,—that Mgr. Wilpert has undertaken, and executed with distinguished success. He begins with the study of the copies of Ciacconio. The latter employed at different times six artists, all men of technical skill, but constantly impelled by their professional instincts to alter or improve the productions of the early Christian masters. Instead of executing their copies, to the last touch, in presence of the original frescoes, they made only rough sketches

> Congerit in cumulum distantia semina rerum
> Bossius: in partes digeris ipse chaos,
> Fœtum ille informem dimisit: tu velut ursa
> Informas artus; restituisque decus.
> Sic animans quod luce prius vitaque carebat
> Naturæ atque Dei mire imitaris opus.

or outlines which they filled in at home, and trusted to their memories for the details of composition, color, and expression. Ciacconio exercised no control over them, and as each artist had his own peculiar technique, it happens that many copies remind us of the contemporary Roman church frescoes, while others are clearly the productions of miniature painters or delicate workers in *pietra-dura*. It is plain that such methods could not produce trustworthy copies of the ancient Christian paintings, and after a detailed study of the whole collection Wilpert concludes that its contents are, as a rule, unreliable, though not all the artists of Ciacconio were equally negligent.

Bosio, a much more capable and serious worker, employed only two artists. The first was a Siennese, generally known as Toccafondo, or Toccafondi; the name of the second is unknown, though the best of Bosio's copies were executed by him. Toccafondo seems also to have had the chief share in the preparation of the plates for the *Roma Sotteranea*. In his criticism of Bosio's copies Wilpert has drawn some of his most pertinent arguments from a codex in the Vallicellana (oratorian) Library at Rome. We gladly make place for his description of the interesting document, especially as it affords an insight into Bosio's method in his preparation of the plates for his great work.

"As often as a crypt or sepulchre containing frescoes was opened, Bosio had copies of them executed. On these he wrote in his remarkably neat hand a short indication of the place of discovery. He seems not to have reflected that his artist could make serious errors, nor does he appear to have been much concerned, at least in the beginning, about the exact correspondence of the copies with the originals. When the plates were being prepared, he visited the originals and compared the copies with them. If they seemed to stand the test, they were marked as approved for insertion in his work. As soon as the plate was ready, the copy from which it was prepared, was usually thrown aside, and most of the first copies perished in this manner. A few were afterwards found among the papers of Bosio together with several unapproved copies. They were handed over to Severano, after whose death they be-

came the property of the Oratory. Later they were bound in parchment and this is the often-quoted Pictorial Codex of the Vallicellana."[1]

The copies in this codex and several of the printed illustrations in Bosio's *Roma Sotterranea*, in both of which the influence of Ciacconio is traceable, are submitted by Wilpert to a careful examination, and their many errors clearly demonstrated. In the future there can be no excuse for being misled by the ancient copies of the Catacomb-frescoes?

Whoever takes an interest in the archaeology of the Catacombs will recognize at once the value of a critical study of these two pictorial *codices* and the plates in the *Roma Sotterranea*. There is no reason why the exact details of the monuments and inscriptions should not be critically and definitely fixed according to the same sure methods by which we fix the text of a classic, or the author, sources, and date of a mediaeval chronicle. Arduous as is the task, it is the first step in the scientific study of the Catacombs, and of great pratical value for polemics, Catholic evidences and origins, art-studies, and the like.

Some of the errors made by the draughtsmen of Ciacconio and Bosio are very amusing. One of Ciacconio's artists reversed an *Orans* and painted him as St. Peter crucified. He could scarcely imagine that the early Christians were unacquainted with Lo Spagna and his school. A scene in the so-called 'Crypt of the Bakers', in Saint Domitilla, representing the unloading of wheat, was converted into a scene of martyrdom. In the same 'huge city of the dead' as De Rossi loves to call it, the patriarch Noah suffers an odd transformation. In the original he is seen standing in the usual box-like receptacle which did duty for the ark among the primitive Christian painters. To Ciacconio's artist the scene suggested a preacher in his pulpit. Close by, a large stain in the fresco took on the outlines of a flying angel *à la* Bernini. When he offered the sketch to Ciacconio, the latter naively contributed the historial note: *Sanctus Marcellus papa et martyr ab angelo*

[1] Wilpert, Katakombengemaelde pp. 46, 47.

Dei in prædicatione edoctus. Another of Ciacconio's artists presents a Paschal Lamb quite in the modern style. On nearer study the upright of the cross is seen to be the staff of a shepherd's crook. There is no transverse bar, but from the curved end of the staff hangs the symbolical milk-vessel. This scene gains in tenderness and significance when submitted to criticism. The same may be said of Ciacconio's 'Eucharistic Lamb,' copied by his artist in the Catacomb of SS. Peter and Marcellinus.[1] It is in reality a milk-vessel crowned with a *nimbus*, from the base of which on either side, a volute-like ornament rises in an upward curve.[2] Toccafondo turned a beautiful Adoration of the (four) Magi into the martrydom of a Christian woman. Under the hands of these

[1] Reproduced in nearly all the works on the Catacombs, see Northcote - Brownlow. *Roma Sotterranea*, part II. pp. 75–76.

[2] "In den vier Zwicken (*Cubiculum nonum*-of the Catacomb of SS. Peter and Marcellinus) sieht man auf den Copien ein Lamm, welches ein nimbirtes Milchgefäss auf dem Rücken trägt, und neben sich eine modern geformte Palme stehen hat. Diese Darstellung erlangte als "Eucharistisches Lamm" eine grosse Berühmtheit und wurde unzählige Mal reproducirt und besprochen. Auf dem Original existirt jedoch das Lamm nicht; das Milchgefäss hat zwar um die Öffnung einen gelben Nimbus, ruht aber auf einem jetzt sehr verblichenen Blattornament, aus welchem zwei Ranken herauswachsen die in einer schönen Volute das Gefäss umschlingen. Die linke Ranke wurde in eine Palme verwandelt, die rechte ging im Rücken des Lammes auf. Meine Zeichnung gibt aber das, was von der ursprünglichen Malerei noch zu sehen ist, viel deutlicher als das Original wieder, da ich die störenden Flecke weggelassen habe. Ich glaubte dieses hervorheben zu müssen um gegen den Copisten nicht ungerecht zu sein." Wilpert. *Katakombengemaelde.* This corrected copy throws light on the words of Tertullian, *adv. Marcion.* I. 14. "Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris qua suos abluit, nec oleum quo suos ungit, nec *mellis et lactis societatem* qua suos infantat, nec panem etc. It is in turn illustrated by the nineteenth canon of Hippolytus: "The priests carry chalices with the Blood of Christ, and other *chalices with milk and honey* to teach those who partake of them that they are born again and as children, after the manner of children, taste milk and honey. . . . The Bishop gives of the Body of Christ, and the chalice. . . . Then they receive milk and honey. . . . Jam vero fiunt Christiani perfecti qui fruuntur corpore Christi." Haneberg, *Hippolyti Canones* (arabice) Munich, 1870. p. 27. Probst. *Sacramente und Sacramentalien in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten.* Tübingen, 1872. p. 153. The last editor of these canons (Achelis, Berlin 1890) places the date of their compositon about A. D. 215. See Duchesne, *Bulletin critique.* Feb 1, 1891.

professional artists a soldier becomes Abraham or a guardian angel, turtle-doves grow into angels or oxen, the fold of a garment takes on the shape of a hare, a lily appears as a staff, Moses is transformed into a headless bird, etc, etc.[1] Some of these errors have been long since corrected by De Rossi to whom we owe the first exact copies of the Catacomb-frescoes. Others "enjoy all the rights of citizenship in the republic of letters." In the interest of truth Wilpert has undertaken to expel them from their usurped honors.

We must be just, however, to the pioneers of Christian archæology. They worked in a somewhat different spirit from that of modern investigators and were less anxious to produce critically correct copies of the frescoes than to find traces of the martyrs. It was a long time before any one thought to seek for Catholic evidences in the ruins of the Catacombs.[2] The literary and religious circles for whom our artists worked were anxious to recover the bodies of the martyrs, or to learn something about their sufferings. Perhaps no better illustration of their views could be found than is given in the frontispiece of Bosio's work, with its scenes of suffering, instruments of torture, and final deposition in the Catacombs. On the other hand, the condition of the frescoes was very wretched, even as far back as 1578. They were then, as now, disfigured by great blotches and weather-stains, the *graffiti* of pilgrims, the breaks in the stucco, various incrustations, and the smoke of candles and lamps in ages long passed. Not to speak of the official repairs made between the fourth and eighth centuries, the violence of the Lombard soldiers in their search for treasure, and the choking of the *luminaria* in the Middle Ages, destroyed or defaced many of the most interesting groups. Add to these the attempts of some moderns to loosen the frescoes from the wall, and we have a series of causes that make the copying of

[1] Wilpert, loc. cit, pp. 25, 28, 33, 49, 30, 73, 19, 22, 23, 70, 73.

[2] J. B. Gener, a Spaniard, was the first to make systematic use of their contents: *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica, Romæ*, 1767. Hergenrœther, *Kirchengeschichte.* (3rd. ed.) III. p. 521. note 1.

frescoes in the Catacombs quite different from the same kind of work in the *Loggie* of the Vatican or under the arches of Santa Maria del Popolo.

In the last century Boldetti and Marangoni reproduced a few scenes from the Catacombs, Séroux d'Agincourt did as much for his *History of the decline of Art.*[1] All of these authors were guilty of errors, which Mgr. Wilpert points out and rectifies *en passant*. It is impossible not to agree with his severe judgment on d'Agincourt for the latter's unhappy attempts to remove the frescoes from the tufa walls. These efforts often ended in the total destruction of the paintings. But d'Agincourt was not the only one guilty of this vandalism. Stevenson relates that he saw in the Benedictine Museum at Catania fragments of frescoes removed from the Catacombs in the course of the last century.[2]

Wilpert's work abounds in interesting details which want of space forbids us treating at length. We read (p. 38.) of a very ancient Crucifixion found in the cemetery of San Valentino beyond the Porta del Popolo. The Saviour is clothed in the long sleeveless tunic (colobium), the feet, pierced with nails, rest on a support, and the eyes are wide open. On either side stand the Blessed Virgin and St. John. Wilpert is inclined to believe that the tunic is a later addition, as after long observation the outlines of the legs and arms have become distinct to him.[3]

[1] Boldetti *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri dei SS. Martiri ed antichi cristiani di Roma.* Roma 1720. 2. voll. fol. Marangoni intended to continue the work of Bosio, but an unlucky fire destroyed his collection of copies and sketches, the fruit of over sixteen years of labor. Séroux d'Agincourt. *Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au cinquième siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au quinzième.* Paris, 1806–1823. 6 voll. fol.

[2] Northcote, *Epitaphs of the Catacombs.* London, 1878. p. 5, and Le Blant, *Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne.* Paris, 1869, pp. 209–215, treat at length the causes of the destruction or dispersion of early christian monuments in modern times.

[3] Some archæologists refer this composition to the time of Pope Theodore (642-648); others, with De Rossi, consider it a work of the following century. The earliest known monuments of the Crucifixion are: 1. On a panel in the ancient door of

We meet with another interesting bit of criticism in his remarks on a copy of a so-called Saint Paul, made by one of Ciacconio's artists in the *Cœmeterium Jordani*, quite near *S. Agnese fuori le mura*. It represents a bearded Orans with the inscription PAULUS PASTOR APOSTOLUS.[1] We learn from Wilpert, who knows every foot of the explored Catacombs, that in the frescoes and sculptures hitherto discovered, St. Paul is never seen alone, but always in the company of Christ and the other apostles, or with Christ and St. Peter, or finally with St. Peter. Moreover the Orans over an ordinary grave represents as a rule the deceased occupant of the same. It is therefore *a priori* very unlikely that this figure is meant for St. Paul. But the inscription? The name PAULUS is often met with on the gilded glasses found in the Catacombs, but never in union with PASTOR or APOSTOLUS. The former word occurs but once in the Catacombs, and then in a very natural place, over a fresco of the Good Shepherd.[2] It is very probable that Ciacconio's artist made an erroneous copy of the inscription. He has betrayed at least one mistake, viz., the introduction of a modern detail of punctuation. He also gives the Orans a beard,—there are no bearded Orantes in the Catacombs.[3] The artist should probably have read PATER and not PASTOR, POSUERUNT and not APOSTOLUS. In the vacant space above the lat-

the church of Santa Sabina at Rome. De Rossi is of opinion that the door is coeval with the church itself (422-432.) Recent art-critics agree in attributing very remote antiquity to this venerable remnant of christian art, 2. On an ivory tablet in the British Museum, most probably a work of the fifth century. 3. In a miniature of a Syriac manuscript of the first half of the sixth century. The MSS. contains writings of Rabulas of Edessa (†435), and is kept in the Laurentiana Library at Florence. Kraus, *Real-Encylopædie*, II. p. 240. The Crucifixion in San Valentino is a restoration of a still older one, whose age it is now impossible to determine.

[1] The inscription is divided by the praying figure in the following manner:

PAV=
LVS. PAS=(orans) APOS=
TOR. TOLVS

[2] De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, vol. III. Plate L.

[3] Wilpert, op. cit. p 8.

ter word was doubtless the corresponding MATER. We have thus the dedication of an ordinary monument by the parents of the deceased, the father's name being PAULUS, while that of the mother is unknown to us.

The scholarly work of Wilpert is executed with a truly Benedictine thoroughness and correctness. His publishers, proverbially known for their devotion to the Catholic cause, and liberal, unselfish spirit, have performed their share in a manner which, for type, paper and finish, leaves nothing to desire. The twenty-eight plates that accompany the beautiful quarto make faithfully known, for the first time, the origins of Christian iconography in Rome at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. They also furnish us with the best means of controlling the author's erudite text. Needless to say that the plates bear him out in all his assertions. His book is henceforth indispensable to all serious investigators of the early Christian burial places, as well as to students of Church history, dogma, liturgy and art in those remote times. It has won for him the rank of an authority in questions relating to the archaeology of the Catacombs and marks him as a valiant competitor for the position now held by the illustrious 'Maestro.' Though yet robust, the shadows are falling about the aged scientist De Rossi. But he has not lived in vain. He leaves a school after him to carry on and perfect the principles and methods of his science, and to delve in the huge mass of material, to the collection and ordering of which he has devoted a full half century. We cannot better close this imperfect notice than with the words of praise which he bestows upon the gifted author of the '*Katakombengemaelde.*' In a letter of congratulation he terms the brief but weighty production: *un bellissimo lavoro di storia letteraria ed iconografica degli studii di archeologia cristiana nelle sue origini al tempo del Bosio.*" [1]

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Paris, Apr. 1891.

[1] De Rossi to Wilpert op. cit., preface.

THE "ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW" AND THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS.

THE continuation of the article entitled "Theological Minimizing and its latest Defender," by Rt. Rev. Mgr. Schroeder, of the Catholic University, which we had announced in the previous number, was already in print when the definite information reached us through the "Osservatore Romano" (May 21), that Canon Bartolo's book had been placed upon the *Index* of the Roman Congregation. It would be wholly against our principles to conduct a personal warfare under the circumstances, all the more because Dr. Bartolo has acknowledged the justice of the censure by submitting without remonstrance and by withdrawing his work from defence. Accordingly the remaining articles on this subject, which had been solicited and were written with the sole object of drawing attention to the dangerous position of Canon Bartolo, *will not appear* in our pages. The decision of a tribunal which counts among its judges the wisest and most erudite of Catholic theologians has made all further discussion unnecessary, and although there remains to all full liberty of scanning the reasons upon which the pronouncement was made, we could arrive at no safer or more definite conclusion in the matter, whilst on the other hand it would be very ungracious to point the finger of criticism upon one who in the words of the Decree: *Laudabiliter se subjecit et opus reprovabit;* thus showing that he had simply erred.

The subject of "Minimizing," as directed against Canon Bartolo's book, has, then, in this instance, reached its end. But we take this opportunity to add a word in regard to the position of the "American Ecclesiastical Review," once and for ever, so long as we are permitted to control its principles and utterances in the matter of theological discussions.

Scientific criticism, if it has any legitimate purpose, is intended to call forth the free expression of different opinions. There can be nothing but gain resulting from this exercise. If, perchance, the opponents believe their views to be absolutely correct and to admit of no just alternative, it does not hinder the unprejudiced hearer from forming his judgment on the merits of the case as presented by both sides. A magazine, such as ours, should fail its object if it were wedded only to one set of otherwise legitimate views whether in the field of scientific or that of practical theology. We espouse no side in politics or "nationalism;" are pledged to no "party" in the social or ecclesiastical sphere, not even to a "school" in theology. Whilst we acknowledge all these divisions to be of their own right because they help by the very friction which comes from their contact to keep life and elicit fresh energies in the great body of the human society—we have taken our stand independently of them. Hence, our contributors are selected without any reference to their personal views, and the pages of the "Review" are open to all ecclesiastics who write on such topics as would interest their brethren in the sacred ministry, provided the matter be handled in conformity with the spirit which characterizes our publication. Of this spirit, of course, the editor must be the judge. As a Christian gentleman need not admit into his parlors every class of persons, though they may have very good qualities, so it will be impossible for us to accept every paper coming from a priest, and though this may occasionally wound the sensitiveness of those who are justly accustomed to be treated with deference, it is as much the editor's misfortune as their own that he cannot introduce them to his reading circle which, we may safely say, is more critical in such matters, than perhaps any other professional class of educated men.

But, whilst the "Review" represents no party in any of those things which admit of a liberal discussion or diversity

of opinion, its boundary is unmistakably defined in matters of Catholic faith. Catholic faith means more than the exclusive adherence to the defined propositions of our creed. It implies a distinct loyalty, a natural attraction to the centre of authority in the Church, whence radiates the living force by which all parts are held together in perfect harmony. This centre is immovable, and every portion of the circle which surrounds it owes its perfection and preservation to the conformity with which it yields to the centripetal law which controls its motion. Whenever any doctrine shows a tendency to deviate from this perfect line, whether within or without, whether by maximizing or by minimizing, it must arouse the suspicion of the thoughtful teacher of Catholic truth. Among the methods by which to test whether a theological proposition is within line of Catholic teaching and sentiment, there is none—apart from divine authority, and the traditional teaching of the Church—which has proved so sure and safe a means as the scholastic method of St. Thomas. It may not, under all circumstances, have proved itself in the same measure as apt to bring out of its school thoroughly practical defenders of the apostolic faith, but this has not been so much the defect of the system as rather the want of a sufficient preparation. The formulas of scholastic theology, like those of the higher branches in the exact sciences, cannot be applied without being thoroughly understood in their fundamental and integral parts. And those who have seriously entered upon this study will readily admit the justice of what Leo XIII. urges in his Encyclical, "Aeterni Patris," when he says: "Omnino necesse est, sacram theologiam gravi scholasticorum more tractari. . . ." If this method be applied as a touch-stone to the so-called scientific developments of philosophic or theologic thought, it will convert them, for the most part, into abstract principles which are inapplicable to the laws of revealed truth, however useful they may prove to the advancement of political or social ideas in modern times.

Theology is in this respect above changes. Her language, her forms, her weapons of attack in polemics may be altered to suit the present needs, but these never touch the truths which are the kernel and the core of all her teaching. When, then, a method is presented in theology which does not merely alter the forms, but cuts into the vital truths; if, instead of confining itself to the application of old principles to new facts, it pares at the principles, such as that of the teaching authority of the Church, then we may apprehend danger. The presumptuous gardener no longer limits himself to pruning the useless branches, to exposing to the potent sunlight of true science the ripening fruit, and to water and dig around—but he attempts to whittle at the *root* itself. This, we must confess, we feared was the case with Canon Bartolo's book. The event has shown that we were not unduly suspicious. Nevertheless, so long as competent authority had not given a judgment, whilst we did not wish to be remiss in pointing out the danger, we were willing to publish Canon Bartolo's rejoinder or explanation, if it were characterized by the spirit and tone which we deem an essential part of our conduct in such matters. And in this we know ourselves in full accord with Mgr. Schroeder, who had no intention to monopolize the hearing in the case. But our disposition to publish the two sides of an argument which was then undecided, should never have extended to the assertion of anything in theology, or under the plea of scientific thought, which would offend, even by implication, against the respect due to the Vicar of Christ, or the sacred deposit of Catholic Faith. We glory in the fact that we do not feel the least in harmony with that liberal school of theologians, who would sacrifice, without thought, the things which God has placed in their trust to the circumstances of the times. In this field we shall ever hold on to the old dictum: Nil innovetur nisi quod traditum est.

THE EDITOR.

THEOLOGICAL MINIMIZING AND ITS LATEST DEFENDER.

IX.

IN pursuing our strictures upon Canon Di Bartolo's book we take leave to invite the reader's attention for a moment to a phase of theological minimizing as it showed itself in England previous to the late Vatican Council. It will serve to throw considerable light upon the method which our author follows and which we have undertaken to criticize in these essays because we are intimately convinced of the danger which is involved in its general acceptance and dissemination.

Although the art of systematical minimizing in matters of theology had its origin simultaneously in Germany and France, the tenets of the "Doellinger-school" on the one hand and those of French "Catholic Liberalism" on the other, found ready entrance and a congenial home in certain circles in England, which aimed at lessening the influence alike of religious and civil authority. This spirit was fostered by the attempts of Protestants in the direction of "corporate reunion" with Rome, which was to be based on a Protestant maximum and a Catholic minimum of belief. However, the opposition of the Episcopate, the Papal Brief addressed to the archbishop of Munich, and lastly, but most emphatically, the Vatican Council put an end to these liberalizing schemes.[1]

With the rëestablishment, in 1850, of the Catholic hierarchy in England intellectual life and activity, which had, so to speak, been completely paralyzed by the penal laws, awoke again and the demand for a superior class of Catho-

[1] The details which we give of what might be called a page from the history of theological minimizing in England, are gathered chiefly from Dr. W. G. Ward's *Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority*, originally published in the *Dublin Review*, 1880.

lic literature was universally felt. One practical answer to this demand came in the publication of a catholic review, "The Rambler," which was succeeded by "The Home and Foreign Review." In 1862 Dr. Ward assumed the editorship of the "Dublin Review." Dr. Ward, we believe, was the first to make use of the terms "minimism" and "minimizing tenets" for the purpose of stigmatizing those doctrines "which tend towards the proposition that the Church is infallible only in what are most strictly called definitions of faith; that she is not infallible in her ordinary magisterium, nor again in branding any given dictum with some censure other than the special censure heretical." (Essays, pag. 23.)

That this sort of minimizing should be found in "The Home and Foreign Review," was not so strange, since the editor, Sir John Edward Dalberg Acton (since 1869 Lord Acton) was a pupil, a personal friend, and an admirer of Dr. Doellinger. To what an extent the opinions of the Munich professor had been diffused in England, may be gathered from a letter addressed by Cardinal Wiseman to his clergy (Aug. 5, 1862). The Cardinal noticed in "The Home and Foreign Review," and its predecessor "The Rambler," "the absence, for years, of all reverence in the treatment of persons and things deemed sacred; its grazing over the very edge of the most perilous abysses of error; and its habitual preference of uncatholic to Catholic instincts, tendencies and motives."

The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Ullathorne, expressed his censure of the same periodical in the following impressive terms: "Many things go to form the integral belief of the Church that were never formally defined; for there is an unwritten as there is a written Rule of faith, *a statute and a common law of believing*. The decrees of faith but incorporate and fix the common belief in formal terms, as circumstances call for dogmatic declarations. . . . The Church's decisions live in the hearts of the faithful, and express not

more but less than her entire belief. . . . There yet remain, unfixed by decrees, both doctrines of faith, and moral laws, and fundamental principles of the Church's constitution and discipline, without which the Church would not be what Christ made her. Under whatever pretext of science or criticism, and under whatever plea of their not being defined, to attempt to strip religion of these doctrines, or of that inner theology, which is inseparable from faith, or from fixed principles such as faith presupposes, or even from the theology generally taught and preached; or to separate religion from that sacred history, on which her evidence, or her doctrine, or her edification reposes, would be to incur the charge and the sin of inculcating, as the case may happen to be, heresy, or what approximates to heresy, or is rash, or scandalous, or offensive to pious ears."[1]

The Brief addressed by Pius IX to the Archbishop of Munich, (Dec. 21, 1863), brought "The Home and Foreign Review" to a sudden close. The "Dublin Review" (July, 1864), comments as follows on the fact: "This periodical (the H. and F. R.), during its brief career, has exhibited a vast amount of learning and of mental activity, but it has been animated throughout by profoundly anti-catholic principles. Soon after its first number was issued, the English Bishops, acting under a sanction still higher than their own, warned the faithful against its tendencies. And its editor has now frankly admitted (p. 688) that it 'would surrender the whole reason of its existence if it ceased to uphold principles which the Holy See in this very Brief has formally rejected' . . . . Sir J. Acton has now appended his name as responsible editor . . . . This valedictory article (8 Apr. 1864), consists of one sustained and energetic attack on the principles enunciated by the Holy Father."

We subjoin a paragraph from this valedictory article, to enable the reader to judge for himself of the spirit which it

[1] On certain methods of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*, pp. 55, 56.

breathes: "What is the Holy See in its relation to the masses of Catholics, and where does its strength lie? It is the organ, the mouth, the head of the Church. Its strength consists in its agreement with the general conviction of the faithful. When it expresses the common knowledge and sense of the age, or of a large majority of Catholics, its position is impregnable. The force it derives from this general support makes opposition hopeless, and therefore disedifying, tending only to division, and promoting reaction rather than reform. The influence by which it is to be moved must be directed first on that which gives its strength, and must pervade the members in order that it may reach the head. While the general sentiment of Catholics is unaltered, the course of the Holy See remains unaltered too. As soon as that sentiment is modified, Rome sympathizes with the change. The ecclesiastical government, based upon the public opinion of the Church and acting through it, cannot separate itself from the mass of the faithful, and keep pace with the progress of the instructed minority. It follows slowly and warily and sometimes begins by resisting and denouncing what in the end it thoroughly adopts. Hence a direct controversy with Rome holds out the prospect of great evils, and at best a barren and unprofitable victory. The victory that is fruitful springs from that gradual change in the knowledge, the ideas, and the convictions of the Catholic body; which in due time overcomes the natural reluctance to forsake a beaten path, and by insensible degrees, compels the mouthpiece of tradition to conform itself to the new atmosphere with which it is surrounded. The slow, silent, indirect action of public opinion bears the Holy See along, without any demoralizing conflict or dishonorable capitulation. This action it belongs essentially to the graver literature to direct." (p. 686).

The Contributors to "The Home and foreign Review" combined a second and a third time. The "North British" came into their hands in 1869-70, so as to give them an op-

portunity of writing corporately on the Council. Previous to this they had started a weekly journal called the "Chronicle." The Vatican definitions of 1870 made it impossible for these writers further to exercise, to any important extent, their baneful influence over English Catholic thought.

As stated above, the growth of minimizing among English Catholics was influenced by the movement in favor of "corporate reunion." This movement was in full swing in 1862. Two years later it received additional strength and prominence through the publication of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon." As a rule, says Dr. Ward, the Unionists exhibited (I think) a far less secularizing and (what I may call) free-thinking spirit, than did the writers of the "H. and F. Review." "As set-off, the latter were doubtless greatly superior to the former in power of mind, knowledge and intellectual accomplishments." (Essays, p. 19–20). The schemes of corporate union received "a heavy blow and great discouragement" through the definition of Papal Infallibility and through the repeated condemnation of liberal principles by the Holy See.

One cannot forbear asking the question: Could the reading public of the above Reviews have been aware of or suspected the fact that the editors had intentionally espoused the cause of "minimizing" on such principles as are implied in the case? or that they would attempt to defend their liberalism with such weapons as they employed? Surely not. It is on this account mainly that we revert to this phase of the minimizing tendency in England, for it will show the more clearly how extremely dangerous the practice is; and at the same time it will illustrate the chapter which is to follow. Nor have we any doubt that the consideration of the nature and purpose of "minimizing" will greatly serve our purpose in explaining the disastrous errors to which it has invariably led, and of necessity leads.

It is not to be forgotten that the authors, whose teaching we here analyze, wrote and taught, as they did, before the

Vatican Council. Whilst the tendency of "minimizing" was more or less common to them all, they were regarded as Catholic writers. We wish to lay stress on this. Under the guise of scientific theology Doellinger assumed to himself the part of judging what constituted the maximum of the Church's infallibility and thus to determine the minimum of what faith enjoined upon our conscientious belief. The school styled its system that of the "liberal theology." But the name is of little account since liberalism in theology and minimizing in theology have one and the same purpose, namely to limit and to reduce the authority of the magisterium of the Church as far as possible. When the Vatican Council eventually confronted Doellinger with the teaching of true theology instead of taking the theology of his school as a standard, he did not shrink from an open breach with her. This sad example certainly proves nothing *against* the dangers of minimizing. On the other hand it would be unjust to determine from Doellinger's action the theological sentiments of those who before the Council had favored or belonged to his school. We are dealing objectively with the principles of that school, and we are well aware that many who seemed to abet the cause of minimizing in theological matters, particularly in Germany and France, have publicly repudiated consequences, drawn by others of the same school, and have subsequently given ample proof of their attachment to holy Mother Church.

Canon di Bartolo has written many years *after* the council in which the question concerning the *subject* of the Church's Infallibility had been most lucidly set forth and thoroughly solved. Morover there must have been present to him those errors so manifestly condemned. There is therefore a twofold reason, why he, as the author of a book treating ex professo of these important questions should follow the rule which he himself has laid down: "theology, no less than other sciences, is bound to be precise in its language, accurate in its expressions and reasoning." (p. 152). But

it is precisely this precision and acccuracy that is wanting to his book, *particularly* in that part, where he treats of the subject of Infallibility. Now, if anywhere, we expect him here to be most accurate in setting forth this doctrine for young theologians and catholic readers generally, for upon a right conception of it necessarily hinges a true understanding of the fundamental question concerning the Constitution of the Church and its magistracy. Nevertheless in this chapter the author's language is anything but "precise" and "accurate." On the contrary, it is obscure, ambiguous and apt to convey imperfect, if not false notions to the mind of the inexperienced reader.

X.

"*Patti Chiari.*"

It is plain then why we propose to unite with the examination of Canon di Bartolo's book a special study of the *nature* and *dangers* of Minimizing *in general.* We shall examine the *guiding principle*, the *pretexts*, the *aim* and the *means* used for its attainment.

The explanation given by Canon Bartolo of Papal Infallibility (93-96) is such, that it *can be understood in a heterodox sense* just as well as in a catholic sense. His thesis does not clearly teach the infallibility *such as it has been defined by the Vatican Council.* From the point of view of the "Severe logic" and the "harmony of doctrines" (in the name of which B. rejects the catholic doctrine concerning dogmatical facts; see our preceding articles)—the thesis and its exposition do not contain a single phrase which is a clear and peremptory denial of the doctrine of heterodox schools. On the contrary, the same schools will find in the spirit of the book and in *explicit assertions* of the author, positive arguments in favor of their heresy, as we shall prove later on. However the reader may convince himself at once by comparing pages.

We have remarked more than once that the "Criteria" abound in quotations of every kind, and we have given samples of the "scientific" method, with which the author chooses and arranges some in order to suit his case, and omits others that do not agree with his theory. We notice the same in the present instance. Who would believe, that when speaking *ex professo* (from pp. 93 to 123) on this important subject of Papal Infallibility, B. does not even once quote the decisive, clear and explicit words of the Vatican Council.

He promised us in the preface that his "propositions would be accompanied by proofs which would support them, and throw light upon them" (37). Now, with regard to the proposition which declares the infallibility of the Pope speaking ex cathedra (93), we find no proofs. We find indeed seven lines, telling us, that whether the Pope teaches alone or together with the Bishops, "it is always *the Church* instituted by Jesus Christ which teaches" (93). Then follow quotations taken from very good writers, but carefully chosen, so as to confirm the author's explanation, by repeating in one manner or another that "the decisions of the Pope are the decisions of the Church *because the body speaks* and decides in the head and with the head." And it is after these last words quoted from Muzzarelli,[1] that B. adds:

[1] Muzzarelli died in 1813. B. nevertheless borrows from him a long citation to explain the sense of the definition of 1870. Here is the unequivocal profession of faith made by Muzzarelli: Speaking in the person of the Pontiff, he says: "If I separately from a Council propose any truth to be believed by the Universal Church, it is most certain, that I cannot err." See Manning, The Vatican Council, p. 101. The Cardinal adds: (p. 105): "The sense in which theologians have used this term (separate, separately) is obvious. They universally and precisely apply it to express the same idea as the word "personal;" namely that in the possession and exercise of this privilege of infallibility the successor of Peter depends on no one but God. The meaning of decapitation, decollation, and cutting off, of a headless body, and a bodiless head, I have hardly been able to persuade myself, has ever, by serious men, at least in serious moods, been imputed to such words as separatim, seorsum, or seclusis Episcopis. . . . Such a monstrous sense includes at least six heresies. . . ."

"Given this concept of Papal infallibility, and no other, it is necessary that the Pope, in order to bring his infallibility into action, should act as supreme head of the Church; *thus* he teaching alone is the Church which teaches." [1]

Now we know very well, that these expressions may have a true sense; we know also, that the authors quoted by Bartolo do not understand them in any other sense; but we also know that these same expressions do not express either the *whole catholic* doctrine, or it alone; that, on the contrary, they have been used also by heterodox schools for the purpose of avoiding the Catholic sense. Finally we know, that the Vatican Council took care to exclude *directly and positively* by its definition such explanations, which, while they verbally affirm pontifical infallibility, *may really include its negation.* Hence the Council not only says: Romanum Pontificem.. . . . *ea* infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor suam *Ecclesiam* instructam esse voluit." But in order to point out as clearly as possible, that the Pope is not infallible merely as the organ, or the spokesman, or the mouthpiece of the Church, whether of the universal church at large, or of the bishops assembled in a general council, the Vatican Definition declares, that the Pope is infallible "per assistentiam divinam IPSI in Beato Petro promissam." These words indicate clearly the *personal* and *distinct* infallibility of the Pope (in the true sense of the term). Again the Council, in order to obviate all equivocations, is still more explicit by adding: "ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones *ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ,* irreformabiles esse." "The motive for these words is obvious. They were the *critical* difference between what must be called once more by names which now have lost both meaning and reality, the Ultramontane and the Gallican doctrines." [2]

[1] We have translated as literally as possible the original phrase: "Posto questo, e non altro, il concetto dell' infallibilita, fa d'uopo, che il Papa per attuare la sua infallibilita, si atteggi a capo supremo della chiesa; allora egli che solo insegna è la chiesa che insegna."

[2] Card. Manning, True Story of the Vatican Council; p. 189.

The fourth proposition of the famous declarations of the Gallican Clergy was this: "In fidei quoque quæstionibus præcipuas summi pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas ecclesias pertinere; *nec tamen irreformabile* esse judicium, nisi ecclesiæ consensus accesserit."

This doctrine has been adopted by the Jansenists and in our days by the German and English followers of Doellinger. The simple definition of the "Infallibility of the Pope as head of the Church," clearly declared long ago by the Council of Florence, would in no way have disconcerted these different schools. They might still maintain that the Pope was infallible only through and by the Church speaking through him. Behold why it has been said with reason, that the last words only of the Vatican definition have killed Gallicanism, by taking away every subterfuge and cutting short all equivocation. For the same reason the authors quoted by B. in phrases which admit of meaning, explain in the first place the Catholic doctrine in all its clearness and precision, in order to determine later on with exactitude the orthodox sense of the expressions in question.

It is a fact well known, that the great archbishop of Westminster took a very active part in the definition of the infallibility and the exact formularizing of the dogma. In many works published before the definition the learned prelate has proved the opportuneness and the necessity of the definition in order to remove all doubt and to hinder Gallicanism from "*obscuring* the authority of the Church." After the Council his Eminence wrote a special work "The Vatican Council and its definitions," in order to explain the true sense of the definition. Instead of placing these lucid explanations of the Cardinal before us, B. selects a sentence written before the Council, which by a smart turn admits a Gallican interpretation: "The infallibility of the vicar of Jesus Christ is the infallibility of the Church in its head and is the chief condition through which its own infallibility is manifested to the world." But the Cardinal im-

mediately adds: "To convert this which is the principle of Divine certainty, into a doubtful question and into a subject of domestic strife and fraternal alienation, is a master-stroke of the Enemy of truth and souls." [1]

These forcible words contain in our opinion a formal protest against Canon Bartolo's system of quoting; especially when we remember, that Cardinal Manning has explained after the Council that the infallibility in Peter and his successors is really "personal," "separate (distinct)," "independent" and "absolute;" that "it is not a mixed privilege, attaching to the Pontiff only in union with a community or body, such as the episcopate, congregated or dispersed." [2]

We now understand the eminently practical bearing of the rule which Canon Bartolo gives to theologians: "La liberté théologique s'étend jusqu'à l'interpretation dans un sens catholique d'expressions qui peuvent s'entendre dans un sens hétérodoxe." . . . étant donnés les sentiments orthodoxes de son collègue."

We answer: We do not judge by any means the "sentiments" of the author, but his book; and we regret that he did not *express* in his thesis his orthodox sentiments. We allow that he personally takes in a catholic sense expressions, "which can be understood in a heterodox sense." But this fact can hardly excuse such expressions in a book written for the purpose of explaining catholic doctrine in "all its purity," particularly when the definitions of the Church leave no doubt of the true sense. An author addresses his readers *only through his book*, from which his sentiments "may possibly be inferred." But if the doctrine is set forth in equivocal expressions only, who can guarantee that the inexperienced reader will not understand the dogma in a heterodox sense, that he will not hold as infallible

[1] See "the Ecumenical Council," chapter II. "On the Opportuneness of defining the Pontifical Infallibility," III. 9. p. 47.

[2] See "The Vatican Council," especially the very interesting chapter "Terminology of Infallibility," p. 93. seqq.

truth what is condemned by the Church as error and even as heresy.

The author may send us to other passages of his book, where he expresses himself in a more orthodox fashion. But what will he say to the reader who can see nothing there but a contradiction? and who will warn them that the "licentia secum pro libito pugnandi" is given by Pius VI.[1] as a characteristic note of the school, certain doctrines of which are explicitly defended by Bartolo? How can he refute those who prove from his book, that he himself does not take into consideration certain doctrines clearly defined by the supreme magistracy of the Church?

He says towards the end of the thesis: "In our days the Vatican Council, i. e. the Teaching Church, has established clearly the concept of infallibility;" why then does he avoid quoting this "clear concept?"

We may be permitted therefore to argue from all this, that the "Criteria" do no credit to their name, but rather expose the reader to the danger of drawing therefrom confused and even heterodox notions of catholic dogma. However orthodox Canon di Bartolo's sentiments may be, his book is dangerous.

In this connection we shall quote another sentence from the "Criteria," which has special reference to our critique and which we desire to acknowledge at once. Canon di Bartolo warns us: "Que les catholiques *à vues étroites* (*a spiriti ristretti*) *et étrangers aux données scientifiques* apprennent à respecter, dans la discussion, les opinions de leurs frères. La liberté est une condition rigoureusement nécessaire (impreteribilmente necessaria) à l'intelligence humaine pour la recherche et la découverte de la vérité. Le théologien privé qui, sans autorité infaillible, prétend s'imposer, attaque la liberté et rend l'intelligence impuissante à conquérir le vrai; il *est coupable de lése-humanité* (egli è reo di lesa humanità)." p. 154. See p. 155. We

[1] See April number of *Am. Eccl. Review*, p. 294, note.

are therefore properly warned, and we know now what is waiting for us. We are accustomed, however, to hear and read precisely the same things on the part of the adversaries of the Church. Phraseology, sensational language, misuse of words directed against catholics in the name of science and liberty have always been the privileged weapon of those who by a contradiction, strange on one side, and natural on the other, appropriate to themselves the monopoly of the one and the other. Tacitus already confirms this experience: "Sæpe libertas et speciosa nomina prætexantur, nec quisquam alienum servitium et dominationem sibi concupivit, *ut non eadem ista vocabula usurparet.*" (Hist. l. 4 c. 23). These phrases are nowhere less appropriate than in a theological book, partly on account of their frivolity, and partly on account of their double meaning. Are not all catholics called by the Rationalists of all the anti-religious schools, men of "narrow views" and "strangers to the results of science?" They will continue to fling at us these old accusations as long as a Pope will publish Encyclicals and censure errors, as long as Councils will formulate definitions, as long, in one word, as divine Revelation will like a sovereign law, demand from the intellect and will of man perfect and unrestricted submission.

And if we speak of Catholics only, will the Canon dare to declare, that his "views" or those of his school are the only true ones! that only his school represents true science? Certainly not. It would be too great a "petitio principii" for "a private theologian without infallible authority."

But that "impreteribilmente necessaria" liberty, what does it mean? Physical liberty, yes, common sense teaches that, and no theologian, no Pope will deprive him of it. Moral liberty? The liberty of interpreting without being embarrassed by any law? No. If that be rigorously necessary, then the only system worthy of the human intellect is absolute Rationalism. Are Catholics free in the search of revealed truth, which is the object of Theology?

By no means. It come to us from only one source, and in presence of a truth, propounded by the Church, we need no longer "search;" we have only "redigere intellectum in captivitatem fidei," as the great Apostle declares. The knowledge of faith, i. e., of revealed truth and religion rests essentially upon the virtue of faith, upon that faith, which is commanded "fides *imperata*"—to man by the divine authority of God and His representatives on earth.

The obedience of a Catholic with regard to the supreme authority of the Church, is reasonable, because he submits himself to divine authority. It is a supernatural virtue, because this same divine authority is its motive, and divine grace its support; it is really Catholic and perfect when it is absolute, when it frankly accepts every decision of this authority. This perfect obedience has always been, as Leo XIII. says, "the distinctive note of a good Catholic." Moreover this obedience preserves the intelligence from error; it aids man as a "stella rectrix" even in the study of human sciences, leads him safely to truth and consequently to *true liberty*, according to the divine saying: "veritas liberabit vos."

What does Canon Bartolo mean when he speaks of: "the private theologian without infallible authority?" To whom does he address himself? As to theologians who attribute to themselves "infallible authority," we discover only those who do not submit to the decisions of the magistracy of the Church, and who consequently believe themselves infallible, not her; who would have the Church listen to them rather than that they should learn from her. And the theologian who puts in practice the "liberty" of ignoring, contradicting, and even falsifying [1] doctrines defined by the teaching Church, certainly believes himself superior to any criticism of a private theologian.

But every private theologian has most assuredly the right of denouncing such an abuse of "theological liberty," and of

[1] The following articles will furnish a few examples of this "Liberty."

preventing the betrayal of the divine rights of the Church when they are lessened under the pretext of defending those of "Humanity." He certainly will not accomplish his aim by simply opposing his own "opinions," or the "opinions" of any school whatever to his liberal colleague. But he may prove that certain doctrines are either not conformable or even contrary to a teaching, with respect to which there is no other "liberty" left to a Catholic but that which honors him most, namely, filial submission.

Our platform in every discussion with a *catholic theologian* is the following: "Summus est magister in Ecclesia Pontifex Romanus. Concordia igitur animorum sicut perfectum in una fide consensum requirit, ita voluntates postulat Ecclesiae Romanoque Pontifici perfecte subjectas atque obtemperantes ut Deo. Perfecta autem esse obedientia debet, quia ab ipsa fide præcipitur, et habet hoc commune cum fide, ut *dividua* esse non possit: imo vero, si *absoluta* non fuerit et numeros omnes habens, obedientiae quidem *simulacrum* relinquitur, *natura* tollitur. Cuius modi perfectioni tantum christiana consuetudo tribuit, ut illa *tanquam nota internoscendi catholicos et habita semper sit et habeatur.*" (Leo XIII; Encycl. "Sapientiae Christianae."[1]

(*To be continued*).

J. SCHROEDER.

[1] The Pope quotes the following beautiful words of St. Thomas: "Manifestum est autem quod ille, qui inhæret doctrinis Ecclesiæ tanquam infallibili regulæ, *omnibus* assentit, quæ Ecclesia docet: alioquin, si de his, quæ Ecclesia docet, *quæ vult tenet, et quæ non vult non tenet,* iam non inhæret Ecclesiæ doctrinæ sicut infallibili regulæ, sed *propriæ voluntati.*"

TITULARS IN JULY.

I. VISITATION OF THE B. V. MARY (JULY 2d).

Jul. 2, Dupl. 1. cl. sine ulla com. De Octava fit 4. et 7. Jul. et Oct. celebratur 9. Jul. Reliq. dieb. fit ejus com. except. 5. Jul.

Pro Clero Romano, com. Oct. singul. dieb. et fest. Prodig. B. M. V. permanent. transferend.

II. FEAST OF THE PRECIOUS BLOOD (JULY 5th).

Jul. 5, Dupl. 1. cl. Com. Dom. tant. De Octav. fit 7. 9. et 11. Jul. et Octava celebrat. 12. Jul. cum com. S. Joan. Gualb. Dom. et SS. Mart. Reliq. dieb. fit com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra cum com. Oct. singul. dieb.

III. SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS (JULY 5th).

Jul. 5, Dupl. 1. cl. Com. Dom. transfert. fest. Pretios. Sang. in 6 Jul. et de Oct. SS. Ap. fit ut simplex. De Oct. fit. 9. et 11. Jul. et Oct. celebrat. 12. Jul. unde permanent. transfert. S. Joan. Gualb. in 21. Jul. Reliq. dieb commemor. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, Fest. Pretios. Sang. transfert. in 6. Jul. et Fest. S. Joan. figitur 7. Sept.

IV. ST. KILIAN (JULY 8th).

Jul. 8, Dupl. 1. cl. S. Elizab. transfert. perman. in 9. Jul. et S. Henric. in 21. Jul. *Pro Clero Romano* S. Elizab. in 7. Sept. et S. Henric. in 13. Sept. In Calend. commun. fit de Oct. 11. Jul.

V. ST. BONAVENTURE (JULY 14th).

Jul. 14, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit com. sing. dieb. et Oct. celebrat. 21. Jul. cum com. S. Prax. Pro Clero Romano S. Alexius ulterius figend. in prima die libera.

VI. ST. HENRY (JULY 15th).

Jul. 15, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 21. Jul. et Octava celebrat. 22. Jul. ex qua permanent. movend. S. Maria Magd. in 27. Jul. *pro Clero Romano* autem in 7. Sept. vel aliam diem de se liberam.

VII. OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL (JULY 16th).

Jul. 16, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 21. Jul. et Oct. celebrat. 23. Jul. ex qua perman. movet. S. Apoll. in 27. Jul. *pro Clero Romano* in 7. Sept.

VIII. ST. VINCENT OF PAUL (JULY 19th).

Jul. 19, Dupl. 1. cl. com. Dom. De Oct. fit. 21. Jul. et ejus com. singul. dieb. except. 25. De die Octava fit ut simplex.
Pro Clero Romano S. Symmach. figend. 13. Aug.

IX. ST. MARY MAGDALEN (JULY 22d).

Jul. 22, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 27. Jul. et cujus com. omittit. 25. et 26. Jul. De die Octava fit. 29. Jul. ex qua movetur S. Martha in diem seq.
Pro Clero Romano, S. Felix figend. 7. Sept.

X. ST. LIBORIUS (JULY 23d).

Jul. 23, Dupl. 1. cl. S. Apoll. transfert. in 27. Jul. et de Oct. quæ non commemor. 25. et 26. Jul. fit 27.
Pro Clero Romano, S. Apollinar. transfert. permanent. in 7. Sept. et S. Martha ulterius in primam diem de se liberam.

XI. ST. FRANCIS SOLANO (JULY 24th).

Jul. 24, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. quæ non commemor. 25. et 26. Jul. De ea fit. 27. et 30. Jul. et de die Oct. fit. 31. Jul. ex qua permanent. movetur S. Ignat. in 9. Aug.
Pro Clero Romano, com Oct. per omn. dies except. 25. et 26. Jul. S. Ignat. movend. in 7. Sept.

XII. ST. JAMES THE GREAT (JULY 25th).

Jul. 25, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. quæ non commemor. 26. Julii et de qua fit 27. et 30. Jul. Fest. S. Petr. movend. in 9. Aug. et *pro Clero Romano* in 7. Sept.

XIII. ST. ANN (JULY 26th).

Jul. 26, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. de qua fit 27. et 30. Jul. et ex cujus Octava S. Alph. movend. in 9. Aug. *Pro Clero Romano* S. Stephan. movend. in 7. Sept.

XIV. ST. IGNATIUS (JULY 31).

Jul. 31, Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. quæ commemoratur per singul. dies et cujus Octava celebratur 7. Aug. unde perpetuo movend. S. Cajetan. in 9. Aug. *pro Clero Romano* in 7. Sept. nisi jam superius fixus.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

Devotions during the Night.

Qu. Is it forbidden on Holy Thursday night to have lay-people in a quasi-parish watch and pray *all night* in the Chapel of the Repository? In the Chapel there is Mass said and a regular Tabernacle with key.

I know what De Herdt and Wapelhorst say, but I don't conclude from them that such a watch is forbidden. You would greatly oblige some of the readers of your Review if you would decide a controversy on the subject.

Resp. It is contrary to general ecclesiastical discipline to have the churches or chapels, where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, open during the night. For exceptional cases, such as the Forty Hours Prayer and the Midnight Mass at Christmas, we have special legislation, whilst all customs in the matter are referred to the jurisdiction of the Ordinaries. St. Charles in different parts of his *Acta Ecclesiæ Mediol.* prohibits in general all kinds of devotions, processions, etc., during the night. Even where the Forty Hours adoration is continued uninterruptedly, the doors are to be kept closed, and only men to be admitted and they are to request entrance by knocking. In the chapels of Nuns where the Blessed Sacrament is to be kept in the Tabernacle during the night, the religious are free to remain in adoration all night but they may not admit any strangers to the chapel before day-time.

"Quum Oratio noctu celebratur, ne propterea Ecclesiæ ostia pateant; sed clausa, pulsantibus et ad orandum convenientibus, etiam singulis, aperiantur: verum ne noctu fœminis orandi stata hora aditusve in Ecclesia detur."—"In ecclesiis Monialium, quum Oratio hæc celebratur, nemo prorsus noctu in illam ad orandum intromittatur; verum ibi SS. Sacramentum per noctem in Tabernaculo majori repositum, Moniales solum ab interiori Ecclesia adorantes, nocturno eo tempore per statas horas in Oratione perseverent; summo vero mane iterum e Tabernaculo illud depromatur." [1]

Whilst this restriction refers directly to the public adoration of the Blessed Sacrament it sufficiently indicates the spirit of the Church. In practice it would probably be difficult to keep up a custom of public adoration during the night of Holy Thursday, as long as women are to be excluded from such devotions; and a prudent bishop would hardly sanction the introduction of a pious custom which is at once exceptional and likely to be scantily attended. However, there are cases where the Ordinary would find ample guarantee that such devotion is productive of good fruit. It certainly belongs to him to sanction expressly a deviation from received discipline in the Church, whatever the zeal and love for the Blessed Sacrament in individual cases may suggest. We believe the usual formula of the S. Congregation would apply in general: *Non probari, utpote extra communem Ecclesiarum consuetudinem.*

Cure of Altar Wines.

We have on several occasions treated of the manufacture and preservation of Altar wines, and we gave in their proper places such decisions of the S. Congregation as had been published. For the following answers of the S. Office of the Inquisition to the Bishop of Carcassone we are indebted to a recent number of the *Nouvelle Revue Theologique.*

[1] Act. Conc. Med. iv. p. 2.

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine, Litteris datis die 8 februarii currentis anni exponebas :

Ad vini corruptionis periculum præcavendum duo remedia proponuntur :

1. Vino naturali addatur parva quantitas *d'eau-de-vie*.

2. Ebulliatur vinum usque ad sexaginta et quinque altitudinis gradus.

Atque inde quærebas utrum hæc remedia licita in vino pro sacrificio Missæ, et quodnam præferendum.

Feria IV. die 4 currentis mensis Emi DD. Cardinales Inquisitores generales respondendum mandarunt :

Præferendum vinum prout secundo loco exponitur.

Et fausta quæque Tibi precor in Domino. Amplitudinis Tuæ.

Devotissimus et addictissimus.

Romæ, die 8 Maji 1887.

J. D. ANNIBALE.

Interruption of a Low Mass in order to celebrate Solemn Mass.

Qu. Sometime ago, on a Sunday, I was saying a private mass, when notice was brought to me just as I had begun the "Introit," that the priest who was to sing the late mass was ill and requested me to take his place, since there was no one else in the house fasting who could have done so. For the moment I was doubtful what to do. There were some people in the Church attending my mass, and to break off the Holy Sacrifice would have appeared strange to them and perhaps scandalized some. Hence I thought it better to go on with the mass, and, not taking the ablution, to make use of the privilege of "duplicating," assuming that under the circumstances the permission of the Ordinary might be taken for granted. Could I have interrupted the first mass and left the altar? And up to what point in the mass would such an interruption be allowed, if at all? or was it better to "duplicate?"

Resp. According to a Decision given by the S. R. C. (July 3, 1869) in a similar case, it would have been legitimate to break off the mass. This interruption might take place for

sufficient reasons any time before the Consecration. The S. Congregation emphasizes the fact that it would not be proper (non expedire) to duplicate under such circumstances, but that the people in the church should be informed regarding the accident and asked to return for the late mass, in order to fulfill the Sunday precept if possible. We append the *Dubium* and answer of the S. Congregation.

DUBIUM.

An liceat Sacerdoti, qui in ecclesia publica Dominica die privatam Missam celebrat, altare relinquere ad *Kyrie Eleison* omissis aliis Missae partibus ut Missam solemnem cantare possit, ad supplendum loco sacerdotis qui subito et inopinate impeditur, quominus hanc solemnem missam pro populo celebret vel an in tali aut Simili casu congruentius expediat Apostolico Indulto uti bis celebrandi in die de quo graviter oneratur conscientia Episcopi?

S. R. C. respondit: Ad primam Dubii partem in casu exposito licere Missam relinquere, dummodo adstantes moneantur; ad secundum partem non expedire. (Decret. auth. 5440 ad I.)

The Mass of Holy Saturday when the functions of Holy Thursday have been omitted.

Qu. Is a Parish priest allowed to celebrate on Holy Saturday "secundum Missale" i. e. blessing the water etc., if he has been hindered from celebrating on Holy Thursday?

Resp. The omission of the celebration on Holy Thursday would not be a reason for omitting the functions of Holy Saturday, provided they can be carried out with the essential solemnities prescribed by the Ceremonial, with a sufficient nnmber of clerics assisting. To the question "*An Ecclesia Parochialis alligatur ad functiones Sabbati Sancti* juxta parvum Ceremoniale s. m. Benedicti XIII, si sufficienti Clero destituatur," the S. C. answered "*Affirmative* et servetur in omnibus solitum juxta parvum Ceremoniale Benedicti Papae XIII. (Decr. n, 5132 ad V).

As regards strictly *private* masses it is different; for whilst a low mass may be said on Holy Thursday where the functions of the day cannot be carried out in full, provided the special permission of the ordinary be obtained each year for this purpose, private masses are forbidden on Holy Saturday unless a Pontifical Indult allow them for extraordinary reasons. Gardellini, in giving a reason for the latter prohibition, distinguishes Holy Thursday, as a *liturgical* feast, from Good Friday and Holy Saturday, as *aliturgical* feasts. (Cf. Nota ad Decret. 4583, June 31, 1821, where private masses on Holy Saturday are strictly interdicted). The services of the latter two days are characteristic of mourning over the dead Christ. Only the *latter* part of the Holy Saturday functions anticipates the joy of Easter, and though the Mass is celebrated before noon, it really belongs to the night. Formerly the services of Holy Saturday began later and were much longer, so that Mass was not commenced until after sunset when the time for First Vespers of Easter had actually begun. Hence we read in the "Communicantes" of the mass on Holy Saturday the words "*noctem* sacratissimam celebrantes Resurrectionis." This would have certainly no application in private masses celebrated in the morning before the "Gloria" has been intoned in principal Churches.

The Stipend for the Second Mass.

Qu. May a priest saying two masses accept a stipend for the second?

Moralists generally say he may not. But I have heard it argued that he could do so with a safe conscience, *unless the decree forbidding it has been officially promulgated in his diocese.* This reasoning is based on the following extract from the "Elements of Moral Theology" by A. J. Haine, a Louvain Professor: "Nulla exstat lex generalis quæ hoc stipendium prohibeat. Quare declarationes Romanæ an. 1845, 1858 et 1862 stipendium accipere vetantes (exceptis missis in Nativitate Domini, et, in quibusdam Hispaniæ locis, in die Commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum celebratis, ubi stipendium accipere licet)

cum non fuerint promulgatæ sub forma legum generalium, non obligant nisi in diocesibus pro quibus fuerunt latæ, vel in quibus episcopi eas obligatorias declararunt."

Hence, please, answer the following:

1. Do these Declarations require *formal promulgation* in a diocese, in order to become binding therein?

2. May a priest follow with safe conscience the doctrine above quoted?

3. Does the condition of the priests in the United States, where there are but few, if any canonically erected parishes affect this prohibition? Or in other words may a priest who is not bound *ex justitia* to say either mass for his people and who is permitted to say two masses on the same day, accept stipends for both?

Resp. We have not at hand the work of Haine referred to; but assuming that the quotation, as given above is correct, the learned author is certainly in error and that under several heads.

In the first place the Declarations of the Roman Congregations to which he refers as lacking binding-force, because they were never promulgated in the form of general laws, are *not the only ones* which have reference to the subject. Secondly, the principle that a general disciplinary law such as is implied in the Declarations of which the Louvain author takes notice, require promulgation in each particular diocese before having binding-force, is erroneous and not endorsed except by some of the older theologians. A law must of course be known before it can bind in conscience, but it may bind as soon as it is known to have issued from proper authority. Such are the disciplinary decrees published by the Holy See generally. An exception occurs in cases where these decrees come in collision with special jurisdiction or particular rights without mentioning expressly whether these are to be retained or not. Under such circumstances a Bishop may for the time being suspend the carrying out of the ordinances if he deem that it would interfere seriously with the established order of things and create injury to the common interests. In the meantime he is to present the difficulties to the

Holy See and await a definite answer as to the obligation of carrying out the law in his diocese. "Erant," says Lemkuhl (Theol. Mor. vol. I, n. 125.), qui putarent leges R. Pontificis disciplinares indigere promulgatione in singulis diocesibus, ut ibidem obligare inciperent. At hoc, nisi ex voluntate ipsius R. Pontificis est, nullatenus potest requiri," etc. He then gives the reason, on which it is not at present within our scope to dwell. If there were no other Declarations of the Holy See in regard to this matter, except those to which the author cited refers as lacking the essential of promulgation, it might be asked whether these can be called disciplinary laws issued by the Holy See. We have not the least hesitation in asserting the affirmative. Any one who will read the Constitution of Benedict XIV. to which Haine refers, although it is addressed to the Spanish Bishops exclusively, will see that he takes for granted the existence of a general law in regard to receiving only one stipend by him who celebrates more than one mass a day. He speaks of a contrary custom everywhere on Christmas day (which still exists) and on All Souls-day (in the Spanish Dominions). The latter custom he does not allow to be adopted by any one thenceforward, although he permits those who had received a double stipend up to that time, on All Souls-day, to continue the practice as it had become part of their sustenance and there was no danger of its giving scandal. All this contains the recognition of a general law; otherwise, what would the exceptions mean. But he expresses this law in very definite terms in some of his other legislative works which give norms of discipline, not to any local but to the entire church. Thus in his "De Sacrificio Missæ" (III. c. 5.) he says: Moneant Parochos, quibus facultatem iterum eadem die secundam missam celebrandi concesserunt, *ne eleemosynam vel stipendium a quovis et sub quocumque prætextu pro ea percipiant.*

Who first made this law, matters very little. It exists, is repeated by different Pontiffs and enforced by successive decrees of the S. Congregations. A late circular of the S. Con-

gregation of Propaganda refers to it as resting upon *universal practice:* "Ex praxi generali presbyteris non concedi eleemosynam recipere pro secunda missa—etiamsi de illis agatur qui parochiali munere instructi ideo stipendium pro prima missa nequeunt obtinere, quod eam pro populo applicare teneantur." The instruction containing this passage, is addressed by the S. Propaganda to missionary priests throughout the world and bears the date 24 May, 1870. In concluding, it sums up the points to be observed in regard to using the privilege of "duplicating." Among them is the following (IX): *Neque posse recipi eleemosynam pro missis iteratis*, nisi id auctoritate apostolica sit indultum. (Cf. Decr. authent. Muehlb. Suppl. II, Missionar. facult.)

It will have been noticed in the above citation from this letter of the S. Propaganda, that where the parish priest is obliged "ex justitia" to offer one mass for his flock, he cannot receive a stipend for the other. Where this obligation does not exist a priest saying two masses may receive a stipend for one. We quote from Adone (Synopsis Canonico-Liturgica Lib. III, c. IV, n. 1003): Vicarii aut alii sacerdotes curam animarum non habentes, quando bis in die celebrant, secundam missam pro populo applicare non tenentur, *firma semper prohibitione recipiendi eleemosynam pro secunda missa.* (S. C. Concil. 14 Sept., 1878.)

From the foregoing we therefore answer the queries of our Rev. Correspondent:

1. The Declarations to which Prof. Haine refers require no formal promulgation; and even if they did it would not establish his contention, because there are other declarations, and later than those mentioned by him, which have undoubted binding-force for us, inasmuch as they are directly addressed to Bishops in missionary countries.

2, and 3. **Certainly not.**

The late Encyclical on the Labor-question.

We defer the late Encyclical of the Holy Father on the social question to our next number, in order to print simultaneously with it the first article of a Commentary on the important document, showing its special bearing upon American society and politics. The series will be from the pen of the Rev. René Holaind, S. J., whose studies on the question of Labor and Socialism are already known to the reading public.

BOOK REVIEW.

READINGS AND RECITATIONS FOR JUNIORS. Compiled by Eleanor O'Grady.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1891.

The author introduces her work with the following brief preface: "The selections in this little book have been made with the greatest care, and will, we trust, impress lessons of Beauty, Truth and Virtue." We can only echo this statement as true without exaggeration. The collection bears the stamp of conscientiousness and good judgment and endorses the favorable opinion elicited from competent sources by the lady's former publication "Aids to Correct and Effective Elocution."

THE MINISTRY OF CATECHIZING by Monseigneur Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans. Translated into English. By E. A. Ellacombe. With a portrait of the author.—Benziger Brothers. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1891.

Somewhere in the life of Bishop Dupanloup it is related that, on his becoming a member of the French Academy, the gentleman who introduced him to the illustrious body representing the best minds in France, said, that if his candidate merited the distinction bestowed on him, by reason of his literary ability, those who could remember him as the Catechist at the church of the Madeleine, whither he had drawn old and young by his charming instructions, would no doubt gladly award him the present high honor if it were for no other reason than his matchless ability as a teacher of the sacred truths to the young. Dupanloup himself valued no work so much as that of catechizing children. He

possessed an all-absorbing attraction towards the Little ones of Christ. This singular affection never deserted him to his old age, and to it he owed in large measure that later success which made him a powerful factor in the political and social world of France, for he found at his command a generation of strong and active minds whom he had trained in the defence of the Catholic faith from their infancy. If his efforts did not overturn the all too strong element of infidelity in his native land, it often baffled and greatly weakened the radical efforts at destruction of religion by the godless faction which is unhappily still in the ascendancy among the ruling party of France.

But Dupanloup's work was not all the effect of a natural attraction. He thoroughly understood the value of early impressions in shaping the later life of the young. He realized that success in this, as in most other spheres, is the result of careful and unremitting labor. This he emphasizes in his address to the young clergy of his diocese, at a time when the experience of a long and fruitful life in the ministry has taught him the value not only of words but of the means to be employed in snatching souls from the perils of our day.

"The Catechism" he says in his dedication of the present work, "is our great duty, and for my own part, it has always been my sweetest and dearest labor, and since I have been among you it has been my chief and most constant care. . . . . I am not giving you mere theories and systems, but something which is actually practised. . . . . All my life I have been either doing the work of the Catechism, or others have been doing it under my direction. Well, all this collected practice and experience will be brought out in the Discourses which form this volume."

The work is divided into six books. The first contains the principles, the second the methods to be employed. Next follow explanations of the various kinds of catechetical instruction with suitable illustrations of the matter. The entire fourth book deals with the manner of preparing the children for their first Holy Communion. The later stages of Christian doctrine are developed in the treatises concerning the "Catechism of Perseverance." Much additional information is to be gathered from the chapters of "Experiences" and the "Letters" with which the volume concludes.

But in giving an outline of the Contents we cannot convey the spirit of unction which these Conferences breathe and the lively interest which

they are calculated to inspire in the reader. Next to the publication of the Stonyhurst series of Philosophy, we do not know any book published by the Benziger Brothers of late years, which is apt to do so much good in our Seminaries or to shape into a systematic study for the young clergy, the popular teaching of fundamental truth.

EXERCITIEN ZUR VORBEREITUNG AUF DEN EMPFANG DER HEILIGEN WEIHEN. Von Dr. Joseph Mast.—Regensburg, New York und Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet. 1891.

This is an exhaustive devotional treatise on the sacred orders of the holy Ministry, and at the same time a practical guide for the worthy reception and performance of the sublime functions which lead up to and culminate in the Catholic priesthood. The author writes with the experience acquired by the habit for years of preparing Seminarists for the ordinations. The book will serve as an excellent manual during the Retreats and at all other times in the life of ecclesiastics, to animate their zeal and inform their minds.

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGUORI. Translated from the Italian. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C. SS. R. Part I. General Correspondence. Vol. I. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

This volume, which is the first in the series of Letters by the Saint, covers a space of thirty-one years and includes his correspondence with the members of his Institute, with ecclesiastics, and with persons of the world in every rank of society. They are of a more or less private character, dealing with the spiritual condition of individuals or the communities which were under his special direction. The Italian editor classes the letters under the head of "General Correspondence," as distinct from what he terms "Special Correspondence," which is to contain the letters referring to the works of the Saint, the official letters written during his episcopate, and those which are properly called Pastorals. In other respects the chronological order is observed in the arrangement of the letters. There will be altogether five volumes of correspondence, the last containing an index.

The particular value of the letters before us lies in the fact that they contain not only practical rules for the guidance in the spiritual life of nearly every class of persons, but that they picture to us the saint as only letters from his own hand could do it. Their great number, ranging over a space of more than an ordinary life time; their character which

breathes, as was essential, the utmost sincerity; the variety of topics which called them forth, and the difference of the persons to whom they were addressed, all this could not but tend to bring out the inmost soul of one who, had he followed his natural bent would have remained hidden from the world and certainly never meant to speak his own praise. We see there the father who loves his children, but whose practical wisdom is not influenced by any merely human affection so as to take a partial view in measuring their true benefit. Indeed nothing is so remarkable in these letters as the burning love for souls which also characterized the actions of our saint. Such love is ever identical with true wisdom. It is forgetful of self and thence arises that simplicity of expression which likewise strikes us in the writings of the saint.

The notes added to the late Centenary edition in Italian have also been incorporated in the English translation made through the exertions of the lamented Father Grimm whom God has since the issue of these volumes been pleased to call to his reward. After what we have had occasion to say concerning the former issues of the present Centenary edition we need not add anything further in commendation of this great and useful work.